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Introduction

This Background Paper is intended to explain the approach taken by the South Worcestershire Development Plan when considering non-strategic site allocations in the villages and towns across South Worcestershire. It also contains a summary of the sites considered including those that have not been allocated. The intention is that this document provides an audit trail for all sites that have been considered as part of the Development Plan process.

The paper draws on information and data from published sources including the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and The Village Facilities and Rural Transport Study.

This Paper includes:

- An explanation of the selection criteria used in assessing sites available to allocate for housing.
- A summary for each site considered through this process.
- List of all sites not assessed but held on the SHLAA database.

Please note that the document only contains sites considered in the towns and category 1, 2 and 3 villages as set out in The Village Facilities and Rural Transport Study. There are sites held on the SHLAA database that are outside of these settlements and have therefore not gone through the criteria assessment process.
Selection Criteria for Non-Strategic Housing Allocations

Housing allocations need to be based on robust evidence and subject to a transparent process. A broad range of planning criteria has been employed to inform the selection process. These criteria fall into one of the following three categories which are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal for the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP): 'infrastructure/technical', 'social', and 'environmental'. Some criteria are considered 'major'. Potential sites failing a major criteria are not considered appropriate to allocate as they have a fundamental problem associated with them e.g. not deliverable; significant infrastructure deficiencies; not supportive of the SWDP strategy.

Major Criteria
(All have to be satisfied if a site is to be allocated for housing in the SWDP)

- Within or immediately adjacent to categories 1, 2 or 3 of the Village Facilities and Rural Transport Study\(^1\) or within the development boundaries at Droitwich Spa, Evesham, Malvern, Pershore or Worcester.
- The site can be delivered i.e. the landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment).
- The site is not within Flood Zones 3a or 3b\(^2\)
- The site is further than 450 metres from a hazardous pipeline or compressor station.\(^3\)
- The site can accommodate a safe access onto the public highway.\(^4\)
- The site can be adequately serviced with respect to sewerage and water supply.\(^5\)
- Development would not compromise an internationally or nationally designated site of ecological importance.\(^6\)
- The site is not in the Green Belt.
- The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.

Other Criteria
- There is no adverse impact on the Green Infrastructure Network.
- There is not significant net loss of protected open space.\(^7\)

---

\(^1\) The Village Facilities and Rural Transport Study ranked villages according to the number of facilities/services provided locally. These include schools (First, Primary), shops, public houses and public transport.

\(^2\) As set out in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

\(^3\) Confirmation from the Health and Safety Executive

\(^4\) Confirmation from Worcestershire County Council, as the Highway Authority

\(^5\) Confirmation from Severn Trent

\(^6\) Confirmation from Natural England/Worcestershire Wildlife Trust/Worcestershire County Council
• There is no detrimental impact on a Conservation Area.
• There is no detrimental impact on a Listed Building.
• There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.
• There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site/Local Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.⁶
• There is no detrimental impact on Trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order.
• There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap
• There is no detrimental impact on an Ancient Woodland⁶
• There is no detrimental impact on an Ancient Hedgerow
• The site has not been subject to surface water flooding event, as identified in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and there is no viable engineering solution to overcome it.⁸
• There is no loss of best or most versatile Agricultural Land.
• Is not contaminated nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.⁹
• Is reasonably accessible, normally within 400 metres, of a commercial bus or train service.
• Is reasonably accessible, normally within 800 metres, to local services.
• Account will be taken of the number of homes built for the period of 1 April 2001 to 31 March 2010 as a percentage of the settlement housing stock as at 1 April 2001. (As a general guide it will not increase the 1 April 2010 housing stock for the village by more than 10%).
• Would assist in delivering/supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. Parish/Neighbourhood Plan.
• The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.

⁷ Unless this is more than offset by the provision of new public open space within the same parish
⁸ Confirmation from Land Drainage Engineer
⁹ Confirmation from the Contaminated Land Officer
Worcester City Non Strategic Site Assessments

Sites are in numerical order as set out in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Where a number appears to be missing it will be captured in Appendix 1 where there is a list of sites that have been ruled out before going through this process with the reason for doing so.

In order for sites to be considered against the criteria they have to be within the existing development boundary for Worcester.

Not all of the criteria were deemed appropriate for urban sites e.g. the indicative 10% increase in housing stock is only applicable to villages.
### SHLAA site reference
WO01 (Severn Trent land Newtown Road)

### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Letter from Framptons on behalf of Severn Trent dated 4th August 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes (Highways engineer consider existing access to reservoir can be made adequate for up to 100 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (existing residential development, golf course and green space/green network)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (neighbourhood centre 920m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes/No Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>W002 (Land South of Warndon Wood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Representation received from Pegasus Planning 29th March 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to the necessary design criteria being met, in theory access to this site could be achieved from the existing roundabout at the junction of Plantation Drive and A4440. Any other proposal to access the site off the A4440 will meet with the same opposition as Warndon Woods North. Any development proposals will be assessed through the Worcester Transport Models and the impact additional traffic generation will have on the strategic highway network will have to be mitigated against at the Developers expense.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Site promoted for and proposed allocation for employment uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Potential for adverse impact on Warndon Woods Special Wildlife Site and Local Nature Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Potential for adverse impact on TPOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (neighbourhood centre 1,1000m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes/No Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of this site raises major environmental concerns associated with on and off site features. This site is however in a prime location for employment generating uses and it is consider that an appropriate scheme could be developed that avoids any adverse impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period,</strong> (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Representation received from Planning Prospects on 30th March 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Yes (Existing access for unlimited traffic movements including HGVs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</strong></td>
<td>Proposed site allocation for mixed uses. Residential amenity would be an important consideration at the development management stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</strong></td>
<td>Potential for development to refurbish and reuse a substantial listed building currently at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</strong></td>
<td>Yes (100m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes (500m to St Martins Quarter and Lowesmoor Approach Corridor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Edge of City Centre industrial estate in former railway engineering works that could accommodate much higher density development than exists currently subject to development viability. Therefore mixed use allocation provides an opportunity to ensure development viability is achieved and non residential employment generating uses are accommodated on this regeneration site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>WO08 (Middle Battenhall Farm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>To be confirmed by County Council Highway Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (existing residential development and farm land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site includes a SAM. Development could be positive or negative for the future management of this asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Some TPOs within the site but development could easily avoid any impact on these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>No (500m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>(Neighbourhood shopping centre 1,300m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td>Development in this location would have a significant adverse impact on the character of Redhill and Battenhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site is part of a green wedge separating distinct neighbourhoods and is consider to be of high landscape value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO10 (Land at Nunnery Way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Planning permission granted for a football stadium and enabling commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes scheme agreed with the County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Proposed allocation is for leisure and commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Criteria</td>
<td>Other Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>No (600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>(Neighbourhood shopping centre 1,300m some facilities closer, café, hospital)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>WO11 (BT Building City Walls Road)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Representation received from Harris Lamb 29 March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</strong></td>
<td>Yes (mixed commercial and residential area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</strong></td>
<td>Yes (200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes (city centre 300m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</strong></td>
<td>Development in this location has the potential to deliver major townscape enhancements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</strong></td>
<td>Edge of City Centre industrial estate that could accommodate much higher density development than exists currently subject to development viability. Therefore mixed use allocation provides an opportunity to ensure development viability is achieved and non residential employment generating uses are accommodated on this regeneration site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

Edge of City Centre industrial estate that could accommodate much higher density development than exists currently subject to development viability. Therefore mixed use allocation provides an opportunity to ensure development viability is achieved and non residential employment generating uses are accommodated on this regeneration site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>WO12 (Heron Lodge)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No (Representation received from Pegasus Planning Group on 29 March 2007. Site has since been sold and is not being promoted for development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (residential uses to three side of this site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (250m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

This site is the grounds of a listed building and there is therefore a strong presumption against any development that would change the setting of this heritage asset.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>WO13 (Church Farm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Yes (Representations from Crest Nicholson received in December 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone. **</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. **</td>
<td>Access from the A449 to the west of the site could be restricted if Gwilliams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>Farm development proceeds. Access from Cornmeadow Lane subject to design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>standards being complied with, could be acceptable, however the level of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance. **</td>
<td>development will be restricted dependant upon the impact traffic flows will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt</strong></td>
<td>have on the surrounding highway network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (residential and agricultural uses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>Site surrounds Claines conservation but no reason to assume development would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>cause any detrimental impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site. **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk. **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land. **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</strong></td>
<td>No (500m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>No (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 1,700m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site? **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs. **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not materially affect the local character of the area. **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site is located in the Green Belt and there is therefore a very strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td>presumption against any significant residential development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development of the site should not materially affect the local character of the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>WO16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Representations from Humberts received on 26th March 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>To be confirmed by County Council Highway Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (mixed residential and commercial area with elevated railway line to the south)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (250m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 1,300m some services, corner shops and school much closer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site is located within the flood plain of Laughern Brook and is therefore not suitable for residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>W018 (Former Ronkswood Hospital)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning application P11Q0245 for 80 bed care home and 57 extra care flats approved in October 2011 and now under construction. Outline planning application P12Q0232 for up to 200 dwellings to be determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes scheme agreed with County Council Highway Engineers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (existing residential and protected open space)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (150m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood shopping centre 500m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a brownfield site on a major arterial route into Worcester City centre with strong and active developer interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Criteria</td>
<td>Other Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes existing vehicle access adequate for site size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (mixed residential and commercial area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>No (800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood shopping centre 800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site ruled in or out of SWDP**

Out

**Summary**

This site is located within the 0.1% flood plain has not been promoted as a potential residential development site and is in an active commercial use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th><strong>WO26 (Midland Road Goods Yard)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No (existing local plan allocation for mixed use development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes (New access already constructed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>No (adjacent railway line will require noise mitigation measures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>No (600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No (St Martin's Quarter 1,000m some facilities corner shop, school, community/youth centre much closer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Cleared brownfield site, redevelopment may not accord with the SWLP allocation but is likely to be determined before the SWLP is adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>WO27 (Claines Royal British Legion)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Letter received 26 July 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to design standards being complied with, access from Cornmeadow Lane would be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>Part but only recreation uses are proposed within the greenbelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (existing residential and public open space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 1,150m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td>Yes development will support the replacement of the British Legion Club on an adjacent site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site ruled in or out of SWDP**

This site is proposed for a mixture of residential and community uses it will only be delivered if there is sufficient value in the residential element to support the provision of alternative/new community facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No (Planning application P07D0285 for a Tesco Metro store and 18 flats was approved on appeal. This permission has now lapsed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes scheme agreed with County Council Highway Engineers for approved development scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes mixed residential and commercial uses on adjacent sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No (potential for development to enhance the character of adjacent conservation areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No (potential for development to enhance the setting of adjacent listed buildings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (50m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>SUMMARY</strong> |  |
| Site ruled in or out of SWDP | In (part) |
| <strong>Summary</strong> | This site combines the site of tyre fitting depot which is in use and the owners have not indicated that the site is available with the site of a cleared and remediates former petrol filling station which has been the subject of a recent but now lapsed redevelopment proposal. The cleared site is a waste of a scarce resource (land) and is a negative feature on the boundary of two conservation areas. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>WO30 (Land at Battenhall Road)</td>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (SHLAA site suggestion form received from the owner on 27th April 2007)</td>
<td>This an elevated site with a large number of trees which are the subject of a group TPO. A planning application P99K0375 for residential development of this site was refused and an appeal dismissed in Feb 2000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>To be confirmed by County Council Highway Engineers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>No (adjacent railway line, any noise mitigation measures would be likely to be very visually prominent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>No (640m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 750m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>W031 (Worcester Swimming Pool)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Yes (Letter dated 13th August 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Subject to design standards being complied with, access from Sansome Walk would be acceptable, however the existing lay-by would have to be removed and a continuous kerb line across the site frontage reinstated. The location of this access would probably have to be towards the southern boundary of the site in order to achieve the required visibility splays. Due to the width of Chestnut Street the existing access from the swimming pool should be restricted or more favourably closed. Due to the sustainable location of the site, design should maximise use of walking and cycling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</strong></td>
<td>Yes (Adjacent sites are all residential development)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgeow.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</strong></td>
<td>Yes (330m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes (City Centre 800m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</strong></td>
<td>Redevelopment of this site would help fund the provision of a new sports centre and swimming pool at Perdiswell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>The current public swimming pool is reaching the end of its structural life and redevelopment of the existing site with a new swimming pool would be difficult and more expensive than a new build facility on a less cramped site. The existing site in the middle of a popular Victorian suburb close to the city centre would make a highly sustainable housing site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO32 (Masonic Hall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Yes (Letter received on 20th August 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existing access at the junction of Rainbow Hill and Lansdowne crescent is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substandard to be able to facilitate any further redevelopment of this site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and will require improvements. Access directly from Lansdowne Crescent will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be difficult to achieve due to road levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Adjacent sites are all residential development)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (150m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Yes (Lowesmoor and St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td>Martins Quarter 650m,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td>Astwood Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs.</td>
<td>neighbourhood shopping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td>centre 750m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The landowner's preference is for C2 development although they do not rule out C3 use. This site is in a good location close to the city centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>WO33 (Cedar Ave Depot)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The existing access from Cedar Avenue is considered adequate to facilitate development on this site. Subject to design access from Wheelwright Close could also be achieved, however the preference would be to see frontage development only along this road. The traffic impact from any development proposals will have to be assessed in terms of its impact on the surrounding highway network and may as a consequence restrict the development potential of this site. It is now understood that this site allocation has been extended to include land at the front of the site fronting on to Blackpole Road and that the a location is now for a mixed use development site. It is obviously better to have the employment land accessed directly from Blackpole Road but serious consideration must be given to the suitability of the type and location of any junction. Previous comments with regards accessing residential units off Cedar Avenue and Wheelwright Close still apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</strong></td>
<td>Yes (mixed residential and commercial uses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</strong></td>
<td>Yes (400m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 400m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site is an existing local plan housing allocation. The owners (BT) have not however progressed any proposals and are difficult to contact. If the site can be brought forward for development this is a brownfield site that is suitable for residential use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--
| **SHLAA site reference**                                                      | W035 (Bus Depot Pheasant Street) |
| **Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be** | No |
| **developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA)**                    |  |
| **Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.**              | 1 |
| **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**             | Any development proposals need to be in accordance with the objectives of LTP3, i.e. development of these sites will need to support sustainable travel options and not have a significant adverse impact on the operation of the strategic highway network. |
| **Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**                                       | No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water |
| **Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of** | No |
| **ecological importance.**                                                    |  |
| **Is the site in Green Belt?**                                                 | No |
| **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.** | Yes (canal side location could provide desirable homes) |
| **There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**                 | No |
| **There is significant net loss of protected open space?**                   | No |
| **There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?**                      | No (development could/will enhance the setting of the canal side and Lowesmoor conservation areas) |
| **There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).**                       | No |
| **There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**             | No |
| **There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature**    | No |
| **Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally**       |  |
| **designated wildlife/landscape site.**                                       |  |
| **There is detrimental impact on TPOs.**                                      | No |
| **There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**                          | No |
| **There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**                         | No |
| **There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.**                         | No |
| **The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or** | Yes (proposed solution not implemented, redevelopment of this site could resolve this long standing flooding problem) |
| **there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.**           |  |
| **Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural** | No |
| **land.**                                                                     |  |
| **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.**        | Yes (200m) |
| **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from**        | Yes (Lowesmoor and St Martins Quarter 180m) |
| **proposed site?**                                                            |  |
| **Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure** | No |
| **needs.**                                                                    |  |
| **The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not** | No |
| **materially affect the local character of the area.**                        |  |

| Other Criteria                                                                 |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--
<p>| <strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong>                                             | In |
| <strong>Summary</strong>                                                                   | This site forms part of the Shrub Hill Opportunity Zone and is a key site between the recently completed St Martin's Quarter development and the Worcester to Birmingham Canal. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>WO36 (Corner of Lowesmoor Place/Padmore Street)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No (Outline planning application P05D0104 for 45 dwellings was approved in May 2005. This permission has now lapsed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes (Scheme agreed for previous approved development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (canal side location could provide desirable homes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site forms part of the Shrub Hill Opportunity Zone and is a key site between the recently completed St Martin’s Quarter development and the Worcester to Birmingham Canal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Criteria</td>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No (Planning applications P06A0687 for 13 dwellings, P08A0448 for 8 houses and P10A0542 for 6 dwellings were approved and the first two have been implemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes (site was identified as a non-conforming use largely because of traffic in the current Local Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/ surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Adjacent uses are residential and open space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/ landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>No (450m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 450m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDHP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site is in mixed ownership and has not be promoted by the landowners for redevelopment. The SHLAA panel considered this site was too close to the edge of the River Severn floodplain to attract a developer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO39 (National Car Hire Bromwich Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No (Planning application P08C0689 for 8 houses was approved in February 2009, this permission has now lapsed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes (Scheme agreed for approved development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Adjacent uses are residential and open space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (50m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (District Shopping Centre 250m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site was not considered large enough for allocation in the initial version of the SHLAA (10 unit threshold) and by the time this threshold was reduced the site had planning permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>WO41 (Land at Medway Road/Rear of Ribble Close)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (e-mail dated 27 July 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access to site WO41 directly from Medway Road will be acceptable. The development of this site in conjunction with Site WO42 has the potential for traffic to impact on the Newtown Road corridor and in particular its junction with Sheriff Street. It is therefore important that excellent walk and cycle links into the City and to Shrub Hill station are established along with links to Newtown Road corridor bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Adjacent uses are mixed residential/commercial and open space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>No (600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 950m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site has been combined with the adjacent SHLAA site WO42 as this site can provide access to WO42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>WO42 (Gas Holder Medway Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Letter received in 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Site WO42 does not have a frontage to a public highway, therefore access will have to include site WO41 or be taken from Ribble Close which will require third party land. Subject to third party issues being overcome either access option would be acceptable. The development of this site in conjunction with Site WO41 has the potential for traffic to impact on the Newtown Road corridor and in particular its junction with Sheriff Street. It is therefore important that excellent walk and cycle links into the City and to Shrub Hill station are established along with links to Newtown Road corridor bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Adjacent uses are mixed residential/commercial and open space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site/ Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>No (600m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 950m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>WO45 (Land at Albert Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Yes (Letter received dated 1st August 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Access to this site could be taken from either Albert Road and / or Rose Bank, however due to deficiencies in width and alignment of Rose bank access should be restricted to Albert Road only. Due to the sustainable location of the site, design should maximise use of walking and cycling links especially to the City and Shrub Hill Station. Along with links to the London Road corridor bus stops. It is understood that you wish for the whole of this site to be accessed from Albert Road and for none to be accessed off Rose Bank. Whilst supportive of this approach, should any developer propose to serve some development off Rose Bank we feel that a small number of dwellings equivalent to the established use would be difficult to resist should passing bays and improvements be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</strong></td>
<td>Yes (Adjacent uses are residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No (Assumed development will not encroach on the area of green network within the site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No (Assumed that development can take place without any adverse impact on the setting of the adjacent conservation area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No (Assumed that development can avoid any adverse impact on the setting of adjacent listed Buildings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</strong></td>
<td>No (May be able to help relieve existing problems Victoria Avenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</strong></td>
<td>Yes (200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 450m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO48 (Warehouse Portland Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>No (The owners of this site have not indicted that the site will be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>made available for redevelopment and have leased these premises to a youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>check site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes (Existing access from Portland Street is adequate for the current use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Adjacent land uses are predominately residential but this site is proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for community uses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Yes (Sidbury Approach Corridor 400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The site has been allocated for community use as currently the premises only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have a temporary planning approval for use by Worcester City Gymnastics Club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The allocation is intended to safeguard this site for this valuable community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>W052 (Fire Station Copenhagen Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No (The Fire Service are actively looking for new premises)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes (Current access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Not applicable as this site is proposed for retail expansion of the central shopping area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No (It is assumed that development can take place without causing harm to the Historic City Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No (It is assumed that development can take place without causing harm to the adjacent listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>The Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service wish to replace the current city centre fire station on an alternative site. The site of the current fire station could most obviously be redeveloped for a retail use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO53 (King Street Car Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Any development proposals need to be in accordance with the objectives of LTP3, i.e. development of these sites will need to support sustainable travel options and not have a significant adverse impact on the operation of the strategic highway network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>This site is allocated as a mixed use opportunity zone. It is assumed that any residential uses could be designed to provide adequate levels of residential amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No (It is assumed that development can take place without causing harm to the Historic City Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No (It is assumed that development can take place without causing harm to the adjacent listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>Yes (It is assumed that development could help to reduce flood risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site is forms part of the Sidbury Opportunity zone and is owned by the City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>WO59 (Battenhall Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbouring uses are all residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Yes (Redevelopment of these substantial Victorian properties would significantly damage the character of the Battenhall Conservation Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes (The site contains a large number of protected trees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>No (500m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 730m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site is in multiple ownership and there has been no indication that the site will be made available for development. This could not be developed without causing significant harm to the character of the Battenhall Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SHLAA Site Reference

**WO60 (6 to 20 Whittington Road)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>Other Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>To be confirmed by County Council Highway Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbouring uses are all residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife / landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes (The site contains a large number of protected trees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (350m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 1,000m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site ruled in or out of SWDP

**Summary**

Out
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO66 (Land to the North of the Worcester &amp; Birmingham Canal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No (No contact from the landowner through the SHLAA process but a developer of commercial property has discussed development in this location with planning officers.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>3a (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This may be difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Not applicable as suggestion is this site should be allocated for commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site is within the Green Belt and is subject to flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>WO67 (Land to the North of Warndon Wood)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Letter received from the landowner dated 13 August 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This may be difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Not applicable as suggestion is this site should be allocated for commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No (It is assumed development can take place without any adverse impact on Old Parsonage a group of listed buildings within the site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Potential for damage to Warndon Woods Special Wildlife Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No (It is assumed development can take place without any adverse impact on protected trees within the site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>Parts of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>No (600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 1,400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Ruled out principally due to lack of access/highway considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO68 (Old Northwick Farm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Letter received from the landowner dated 22 July 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Existing residential and floodplain/farmland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No (It is assumed development can enhance the setting and character of the River Side Conservation Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 1,500m some facilities such as a primary school are closer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>While this site forms part of the existing local plan green network it is consider that the loss of this small area of green network on the edge of the River Severn floodplain can make a positive contribution to views into the city from the River Side Conservation Area and further away to the west of the city.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>WO69 (Grove Farm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Yes (Planning application approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes (Access agreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Not applicable as suggestion is this site should be allocated for commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Worcester related development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>No (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 1,150m some facilities such as a primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td>school are closer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In (Part)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

This site was a previous Local Plan employment allocation. The SWDP has modified the previous allocation to include health and university related development as well as employment uses. A hybrid planning application P11K0588 has been approved for this range of uses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>WO71 (Land to the East of Nunnery Way)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Planning application approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes (Access agreed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Not applicable as suggestion is this site should be allocated for a replacement stadium for Worcester City Football Club and enabling commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>No (550m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 1,400m some facilities such as a café and park are closer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In (Part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site is an existing Local Plan site allocation for a replacement stadium for Worcester City Football Club and enabling development. Although a hybrid planning application P08Q0652 for this development has been approved it is considered prudent to include this allocation in the SWDP due to the uncertainty about the implementation of this approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO72 (Worcester Woods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Planning application approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes (Access agreed for existing planning consent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes but not applicable as the proposed allocation of this site is for commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (250m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 1,400m some facilities such as a café and park are closer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site is an existing Local Plan site allocation for employment. Outline consent for an office park P05Q0141 and P05Q0191 was approved in October 2006. This consent has not been implemented and the SWDP proposes to allocate this site for a wider range of commercial uses. A small part of the site has consent P11Q0400 for a car park (currently under construction) and a care home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>W076 (Blooms Garden Centre, Droitwich Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Yes (SHLAA site suggestion form received)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>To be confirmed by County Council Highway Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site is within the Green Belt and therefore could only be an allocated development site if there were no other suitable locations for development to support Worcester's needs. As there is only green belt to the north of the city it is clear that there are alternative directions for growth other than within the green belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>WO77 (Upper Battenhall Farm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Yes (Last representation in December 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>To be confirmed by County Council Highway Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</strong></td>
<td>Yes (Existing residential uses, college and scheduled Ancient Monument)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No (Assuming development recognises the significance of listed buildings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No (Assuming development recognises the significance of the scheduled ancient monument on an adjacent site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No (It is assumed development can avoid any adverse impact on TPOs within the site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</strong></td>
<td>No (800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>No (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 1,300m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site is part of a green wedge separating distinct neighbourhoods and is considered to be of high landscape value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong> | Out |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>WO80 (Land off Battenhall Road)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Representation received on 18th June 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>To be confirmed by County Council Highway Engineers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Existing residential uses and sports pitches)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>No (800M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No (Neighbourhood shopping centre 1,000m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The status of this site has recently changed by the granting of a Lawful Development Certificate for use as a paddock. The site was previously a sports field and protected public open space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO81 (Wyvern Service Station)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Letter received on 25th August 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Due to the size of the site, frontage development only is anticipated, which would be considered acceptable in terms of directly accessing properties subject to adequate turning facilities being provided. To be confirmed by County Council Highway Engineers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes(This site is bounded on three sides by existing residential uses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (100m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood shopping centre 350m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>This is a small infill brownfield site currently occupied by a business in a vulnerable employment sector.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

**SHLAA site reference**  
WO84 (Tolladine Golf Course)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes (SHLAA site suggestion form dated 18th May 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed planning consent was recently granted for 9 dwellings off the private road adjacent to the Fairway. This private road was conditioned to be made up to adoptable standards as part of this planning consent. The limited geometry of the drive would not be suitable to serve additional development. For access to serve whole site refer to WO01 and WO18. From a Strategic Highway point of view this site would be best developed in conjunction with Sites WO01 and WO18. The combination of these sites will generate significant travel demand which will require to be addressed as outlined in WO01 above. If WO01 &amp; WO18 are taken forward in &quot;isolation&quot;, the requirements outlined in WO01 would still apply, in particular the links provided to the walk, cycle, passenger transport facilities and services along Newtown Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No (Assumed that development can avoid any adverse impact on protected trees within this site)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Existing residential uses and public open space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (300m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood shopping centre 550m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This is a very visually prominent part of the City’s green network and protected open space. This site is therefore not considered a suitable location for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO86 (School of Art &amp; Design Barbourne Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access to the site will be best achieved from a single access point on to Barbourne Terrace subject to design standards being complied with. Access to Barbourne Road, Thornloe Row and Fountain Place will be resisted on grounds of highway safety. A care home will invariably generate less traffic than a residential development and would be considered an appropriate use of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Existing residential uses surround this site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No (It is assumed that development can enhance the character and setting of the St George's Square Conservation Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No (It is assumed that development can incorporate the Locally Listed building on this site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood shopping centre 220m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The SWDP proposed allocation for this site is for C2 housing which the landowner and a developer are committed to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO88 (Malvern Gate Office Complex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (SHLAA suggestion form received in December 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>To be confirmed by County Council Highway Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Existing residential uses surround this site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (80m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood shopping centre 460m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site is occupied by a relatively modern office complex which is nearly fully let. The site is therefore commercially viable in its current use and there would not be justification for allocation for an alternative use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO92 (Unit 3 Blockhouse Close)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Yes (Letter received in February 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes (Existing access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Mixed residential and commercial area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agroecological</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (330m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Yes (City Centre 400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site forms part of the Blockhouse/Carden Street Opportunity Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>WO93 (Chequers Lane/Henwick Road)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowne(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Yes (Representation received in September 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Part 3a and 1 Dry access from Henwick Road could be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes (Existing access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Mixed residential and commercial area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No (It is assumed any development would enhance the setting of the Riverside Conservation Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes (It is assumed any development could mitigate the loss of existing trees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (300m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Yes (District Centre 500m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

**Site ruled in or out of SWDP**

**Summary**

The owner of this site was seeking development for student accommodation which was supported by the SWDP. It is understood that the site has changed ownership and the new owners may be considering alternative development opportunities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>WO94 (Sherriff Street Industrial Estate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Planning Application awaiting determination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>To be confirmed by County Council Highway Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>? This is a commercial area adjacent to a railway station. Residential amenity will require careful design of any development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>Yes (It is assumed that development will be able to remove the existing flood risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (St Martin's Quarter 750m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site forms part of the Shrub Hill Opportunity Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO95 (Blockhouse Close)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (SHLAA site suggestion form received in 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>To be confirmed by County Council Highway Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Mixed residential and commercial area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (330m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (City Centre 400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site forms part of the Blockhouse/Carden Street Opportunity Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO96 (Land at Stanley Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Letter sent on 24th July 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing car park (for the adjacent school) on this site is to be retained. The addition of six dwellings (and resultant extra vehicle movements) would necessitate improvements to the access geometry which is currently not adequate enough for two vehicles to pass. The necessary improvements appear to be readily achievable within the site boundaries. For new dwellings, full off-street parking capacity standards would be sought as a minimum. The site is reasonably well served by nearby public transport (Service 24 in Tallow Hill/Midland Road and Service 31 in Shrub Hill/Newtown Road). Tallow Hill and Midland Road are formal “definitive” cycle routes and there is formal Walkway route connecting Stanley Road and Midland Road very near to the site. Otherwise, there is the normal urban system of footways and some divorced footpaths. There may be a case for looking at some of these with a view to upgrading, followed by formal designation as “definitive” walk/cycle routes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewerage and water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (adjacent land uses are residential and community uses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>No (500m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (St Martin's Quarter 700m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This is an available brown field site in a well established community it is therefore a sustainable location for additional homes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>WO98 ((Dudley Close))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Yes (E-mail received on 20th July 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>This is a communal garage/open hard-standing parking site. WCH have confirmed that it has not been used for parking for some time. There are no concerns about an “immediate” parking displacement on the public highway should it be developed. There are no particular highway issues. Direct frontage access from individual dwellings onto Dudley Close would be acceptable, as would some form of private drive(s), or even an adopted extension of Dudley Close itself, or any combination of these. However, the common access theme should be off Dudley Close, rather than the original and existing relatively torturous route off Drake Avenue, which clashes with extensive walking and cycling use. For new dwellings, full off-street parking capacity standards would be sought as a minimum. The site is very well served by nearby public transport and walking and cycling facilities. Some footpaths may require upgrading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong> | No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water |
| <strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong> | No |
| <strong>Is the site in Green Belt</strong> | No |
| <strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</strong> | Yes (The site is surrounded by existing residential development) |
| <strong>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong> | No |
| <strong>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</strong> | No |
| <strong>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong> | No |
| <strong>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</strong> | No |
| <strong>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong> | No |
| <strong>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong> | No |
| <strong>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong> | No |
| <strong>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong> | No |
| <strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong> | No |
| <strong>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong> | No |
| <strong>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</strong> | No |
| <strong>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong> | No |
| <strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</strong> | Yes (300m) |
| <strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong> | Yes (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 400m) |
| <strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</strong> | |
| <strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</strong> | |
| <strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong> | In |
| <strong>Summary</strong> | This site is currently occupied by a rank of lock up garages. Infill development of this site is appropriate. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>WO101 (Langdale Drive)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Representation received in November 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>To be confirmed by County Council Highway Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (The site is surrounded by existing residential development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 440m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>The majority of this site forms part of the green infrastructure within the Warndon estate. The loss of this space to development would fundamentally alter the original design concept of the estate and would therefore be unacceptable development due to the detrimental impact on neighbouring residential amenity and to the original landscape scheme for the existing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>WO102 (Brookthorpe Close)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Yes (E-mail received on 20th July 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no particular highway issues. Direct frontage access from</td>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual dwellings onto Brookthorpe Close would be acceptable, as would</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some form of private drive(s), or a combination of both. For new dwellings,</td>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full off-street parking capacity standards would be sought as a minimum,</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>together with any “replacement” parking forfeited by development, unless</td>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative off-street capacity could be found elsewhere. The site is very</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well served by nearby public transport and walking and cycling facilities.</td>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some paths may require upgrading.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (The site is surrounded by existing residential development)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (150m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td>needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 500m)</td>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site is currently occupied by ranks of lock up garages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infill development of this site is appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO103 (Kendal Green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Part of this site forms part of the green infrastructure within the Warndon estate. The loss of this space to development would fundamentally alter the original design concept of the estate and would therefore be unacceptable development due to the detrimental impact on neighbouring residential amenity and to the original landscape scheme for the existing development. If the green network part of the site is discounted the remainder of the site is too small (max 4 units) for a site allocation but may still come forward as windfall development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (Representation received in November 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>To be confirmed by County Council Highway Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (The site is surrounded by existing residential development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part of this site forms part of the green infrastructure within the Warndon estate. The loss of this space to development would fundamentally alter the original design concept of the estate and would therefore be unacceptable development due to the detrimental impact on neighbouring residential amenity and to the original landscape scheme for the existing development. If the green network part of the site is discounted the remainder of the site is too small (max 4 units) for a site allocation but may still come forward as windfall development.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>WO104 (Grasmere Drive/Ullswater Close)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (E-mail received on 20th July 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of the existing site consists of open parking hardstandings and garages. At face value, these parking facilities do not appear visually &quot;derelict and abandoned&quot; and may well be extensively used. Therefore it would need to be established whether their removal would cause parking &quot;displacement&quot; on the public highway. Otherwise there are no particular highway issues. All access to new dwellings could be via Ullswater Close, or all via the existing garage/parking area access off Grasmere Drive, or a combination of the two. For new dwellings, full off-street parking capacity standards would be sought as a minimum, together with any &quot;replacement&quot; parking capacity forfeited by development, unless alternative off-street capacity could be found elsewhere. The site is reasonably well served by nearby public transport (Service 37 in Ambleside Drive) in addition to &quot;typical&quot; walking and cycling facilities common to large urban housing estates of this age and nature i.e.: virtually all roads have footways on both sides, complimented with a myriad of &quot;inter-connecting&quot; divorced footpaths. There may be a case for looking at some of these with a view to upgrading, followed by formal designation as &quot;definitive&quot; walk/cycle routes to add to those which already exist in the locale. Some of the main roads on the estate are traffic-calmed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (The site is surrounded by existing residential development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td>Yes (400m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (Neighbourhood Shopping Centre 200m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site is currently occupied by ranks of lock up garages and derelict/underused play space. Infill development of this site is appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>WO107 (Land to the rear of Kingston Avenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes (SHLAA site suggestion form received in November 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1 (Only access through zone 3b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access appears inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes (Adjacent to existing residential development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) or there is a viable engineering solution to overcome flood risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the local character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Malvern Hills Non Strategic Site Assessments

Sites are in numerical order as set out in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment for each settlement. Where a number appears to be missing it will be captured in Appendix 2 where there is a list of sites that have been ruled out before going through this process with the reason for doing so.

In order for sites to be considered against the criteria they have to be within or immediately adjacent to categories 1, 2 or 3 villages or within the development boundaries in Malvern town.

There is a separate table at the end of the assessments containing the number of homes in each parish in 2001 (Census 2001) and those built for the period of 1 April 2001 to 31 March 2010 demonstrating the percentage growth experienced by parish. The level of growth experienced by each parish and the existing number of homes has been considered within the criteria and when allocating sites.
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>SHLAA Site</th>
<th>MHMT02 - Walsh's yard Poolbrook Common Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood Zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The site is served off a surfaced track which leads form Hayes Bank Road. Hayes Bank Road is an unclassified highway which crosses Poolbrook Common from Poolbrook Road. Its width is insufficient for two vehicles to pass and junction arrangements are considered substandard in their current form to serve the development of this site. Improvements will be needed to meet with the necessary standards to develop the whole site but consideration could be given to limited frontage development without any improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Surface water issues to south of the site - 1 in 200 shallow. Drainage strategy required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Route 42/43 along Poolbrook Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Barnards Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>SHLAA Site</th>
<th>MHMT02 - Walsh's yard Poolbrook Common Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Route 42/43 along Poolbrook Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Barnards Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

Brownfield site. Sensitive location by common, and served by unadopted track, and therefore suggest lower density of 25dph- scope for some frontage development only say 5 dwellings (unless road improved- then say up to 9 dwellings) s. Current density = 15ha

---

Malvern Hills
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our view is that the site should form part of the Malvern East strategic</td>
<td>Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development site and it would not be helpful for it’s design and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation to be considered in isolation from the overall strategic site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any decisions on highway access and circulation may prejudice such decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relating to the wider area. If the site is to be developed in isolation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then preference for access would be to remodel the junction of between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend Way and Mayfield Road. Access to the site from Nightingale Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be resisted on grounds of what the traffic impact will have on the Elgar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate road network which is restricted to access only. Individual direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to properties fronting Mayfield Grove to the south west of the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be acceptable, however access directly to Townsend Way and Mayfield Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be resisted on grounds of highway safety and ecology reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our view is that the site should form part of the Malvern East strategic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development site and it would not be helpful for it’s design and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation to be considered in isolation from the overall strategic site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any decisions on highway access and circulation may prejudice such decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relating to the wider area. If the site is to be developed in isolation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then preference for access would be to remodel the junction of between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend Way and Mayfield Road. Access to the site from Nightingale Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be resisted on grounds of what the traffic impact will have on the Elgar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate road network which is restricted to access only. Individual direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to properties fronting Mayfield Grove to the south west of the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be acceptable, however access directly to Townsend Way and Mayfield Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be resisted on grounds of highway safety and ecology reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our view is that the site should form part of the Malvern East strategic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development site and it would not be helpful for it’s design and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation to be considered in isolation from the overall strategic site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any decisions on highway access and circulation may prejudice such decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relating to the wider area. If the site is to be developed in isolation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then preference for access would be to remodel the junction of between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend Way and Mayfield Road. Access to the site from Nightingale Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be resisted on grounds of what the traffic impact will have on the Elgar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate road network which is restricted to access only. Individual direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to properties fronting Mayfield Grove to the south west of the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be acceptable, however access directly to Townsend Way and Mayfield Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be resisted on grounds of highway safety and ecology reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specified features. Area floristically diverse so ecological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey will be required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>Surface water issues to south of site - 1 in 30 shallow. Flood risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with</td>
<td>assessment required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/ No</td>
<td>Bus stop within 400m along Townsend Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no stat distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Barnards Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield site- past planning permissions accepted principle of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Children’s home on site but not implemented. Past use as BMX site but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not for several years. Adjacent to urban area and recent affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site. Sustainable location. Access possible from remodelled junction of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend Way/ Mayfield Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SHLAA Site** | **MHMT07-BMX Track off Mayfield Road** |
---|---|
- Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period |
- Site not within defined Flood Zone |
- Site not within specified distance for either facility |
- Sewerage and Water supply adequate? No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water |
- Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. No designated areas within vicinity of site |
- Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? NO |
- The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland. |
- There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area |
- There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s). There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site |
- There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM |
- There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features. Area floristically diverse so ecological survey will be required |
- There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. No TPOs within or adjacent to the site |
- There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17 |
- There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. Not applicable |
- There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow. No information on this |
- The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer). Surface water issues to south of site - 1 in 30 shallow. Flood risk assessment required |
- Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. Grade 3 on the ALC Map |
- Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer) No comments |
- Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/ No If no stat distance. Bus stop within 400m along Townsend Way |
- Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? Barnards Green |

**Site ruled in or out of SWDP** In
MHMT08 - Land at Hall Green

### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA Site</th>
<th>MHMT08 - Land at Hall Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This has to the south a frontage to Hall Green and to Teme Avenue albeit limited. Subject to junction design complying with design standards and junction spacing with nearby junctions being satisfied a single point of access from Hall Green to serve this development site could be acceptable. This will restrict development potential to a maximum of 100 units unless a secondary access is provided. The frontage to Teme Avenue could be sufficient to form an emergency / pedestrian / cycle link but not an all purpose access. Individual direct accesses to properties served off Hall Green would be considered acceptable. Having identified that access to this land is feasible, the impact that the development will have on the highway network is considered to be detrimental to users and highway safety. This impact will especially apply to traffic using the C2102 linking B4211 Guarrant Road to A449 Worcester Road via Madersfield Village and various junctions in Barnards Green and along B4208 Pickersleigh Road. Without significant mitigation works to overcome these issues development on this site should be opposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site/ Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No information on this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No information on this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Surface water flooding exists to north of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc); Adjacent Road Haulage. Phase 1 &amp; 2 required with planning application required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Route 43/44 along Brookfarm Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Barnards Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP Summary</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Landscape Encroachment

Summary: Out
MHMT09 - Land at Eastwood Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA Site</th>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Upper Howsell Road is in our opinion inadequate to serve any development without improvement. It suffers from on street car parking, it is narrow in places, existing junctions are substandard and the road is a bus route which also serves the Dyson Perrins School. The footways are narrow and may not be continuous along both sides of the road. Junior Schools are located in Somers Park Road and Church Road so pedestrian routes along this road must be a major consideration. Should development of this site be promoted then the developer will be required to assess and mitigate against the impact the development will have on junctions in the immediate vicinity of the site with the scope being extended to included junctions beyond the site in order to properly assess the development impact, the following junctions should be considered as an absolute minimum - Upper Howsell Road / Somers Park Avenue / Church Road / Howsell Road - Church Road / Lower Howsell Road - Lower Howsell Road / Worcester Road (A449) and Leigh Sinton Road / A4103.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Informal open space - informal dog walking and recreation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM. Note, Site within area of RB ceramic production area and largely intact locally distinctive HLC. Forms a coherent unit with MHMT47 &amp; MHMT49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site, however hedgerow/tree/woodland loss would be to the detriment of landscape character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Wooded area in eastern corner of the site contains a mixture of ash, field maple, goat willow, oak etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Remnant ancient hedgerow along north-eastern boundary with associated ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Surface water issues across north-west of site - 1 in 200 shallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).</td>
<td>No comments received - incomplete co-ordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Bus stops at eastern end of Yates Hay Road and Lower Howsell Road - 500 m from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Close to Dyson Perrins High School. Convenience store &amp; post office within 400m of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

SIGNIFICANT GAP/HIGHWAYS
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA Site</th>
<th>MHMT10 - Land at Halfkey Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to Halfkey Road an unclassified public highway. Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from Halfkey Road to serve this development site would be acceptable. To the north east, the site abuts a private road serving 2 or 3 properties over which a public right of way runs. This road is not suitable to serve the development site. Individual direct accesses to properties served off Halfkey Road and the private road (subject to ownership) would be considered acceptable, subject to improvements to increase the width of carriageway and provide a new footway across the whole of the site frontage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sewerage and Water supply adequate? | No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water |
| Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. | No designated areas within vicinity of site |
| Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? | NO |
| The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. | Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland. |

### OTHER CRITERIA

| Site ruled in or out of SWDP | Out |

<p>| Summary | NOT AVAILABLE |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Site</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHMT12-Land at Lower Howsell Road Allotments</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The site in question abuts the Strategic Site Allocation known as Newlands, Malvern (MHMT32 and 24). At meetings that have taken place with prospective developers of this allocated site, the Highway Authority’s position has been clearly stated that no access to the site will be permitted from Lower Howsell Road due to increased traffic flows and problems of access. They have a frontage to this road nearer to the railway line to the north of this development site (MHMT12). The junction between Lower Howsell Road and Worcester Road has had traffic signals installed which only allows a left turn out of the junction. Right turning vehicles have to use other local residential roads and any increased along these roads of flows will be unacceptable. The Highway Authority’s position with regards this site is that it should be entirely accessed from the adjacent site MHMT32, the exception being if frontage development along Lower Howsell Road and Vandra Close to complete the street scenes were identified, then consideration will be given to accessing properties directly from these roads.</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Site adj to residential development</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Identified as public open space - QL2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Highly sensitive area as identified by County Archaeologist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
<td>Site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No information supplied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>No information supplied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Bamards Green</td>
<td>Yes, Worcester Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Potentially in if can be accessed via Newland site to North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The site is identified in the Local plan as Malvern Urban Greenspace and contributes to landscape character. It is not however used for allotments or other open space and is currently used as agricultural land. There is scope for some housing development, if accessed through the Newland site to the north, and this would help secure some public open space in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

**Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).**

- Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period

**Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.**

- Site not within defined Flood Zone

**Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**

- Site not within specified distance for either facility

**The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**

**Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**

- No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

**Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**

- No designated areas within vicinity of site

**Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**

- No

**The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.**

- Yes - Site adj to residential development

**There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**

- Important series of rights of way across site

**There is no significant net loss of protected open space?**

- Identified as public open space - QL2 identified in the Malvern Urban Greenspace Study

**There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**

- Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area

**There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).**

- Yes - the marker posts are listed for their historical significance

**There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**

- Unknown

**There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**

- The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features

**There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**

- Yes - group TPO affects the sites

**There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**

- The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17

**There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**

**There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.**

- No information supplied

**The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).**

- Surface water run off across the site from east to west

**Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**

- Grade 3 on the ALC Map

**Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).**

- No information supplied

**Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.**

- St Andrews Road/Court Road

**Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**

- Barnards Green/Malvern Link

**Site ruled in or out of SWDP.**

- Out

### OTHER CRITERIA

**Summary**

- Site is important to landscape character of Malvern, contributing to the open character and views of hills from this part of town, and for public rights of way.
## MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA Site</th>
<th>MHMT17 - Land off Welland Road Upper Welland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to C2221 Upper Welland Road and Assarts Road an unclassified highway. Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from C2221 Upper Welland Road to serve this development site would be acceptable. Individual direct accesses to properties served off both C2221 Upper Welland Road subject to adequate tuning facilities being provided and Assarts Road would be considered acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Site adj to residential development/recreation/agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is within Malvern Wells Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Views from the north largely screened by a belt of trees running east to west. Tree belt protected by Tree Preservation Order 237 (1992) - Upper Welland Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Development of the site would be contrary to the existing settlement pattern and landscape character (enclosed commons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Local views from Assarts Road are limited by the roadside hedge although its long-term retention cannot be relied upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Local flood risk possible. Will require flood risk assessment and local drainage strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, on the Wells Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, facilities on the Wells Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OTHER CRITERIA

### Summary

Site is within the AONB and the Conservation Area, and therefore in landscape and wider conservation terms is ruled out.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Criteria</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood Zone.</td>
<td>Site not defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has to the north and east a frontage to Elgar Avenue, but the limits of the public highway do not appear to abut the site frontages and therefore the assumption has been made that third party land is involved. To the west the current football stadium takes access from Langland Avenue. This access, subject to the current layout complying with design standards is considered acceptable to serve the development site. The development of this site should however be restricted due to what the traffic impact will have on the Elgar Estate road network which is restricted to access only. The developer will be required to demonstrate how mitigation works will alleviate the impact development will have. Individual direct access to properties fronting Elgar Avenue to the north and east of the site would be acceptable subject to land issues being resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Site adjacent to residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site subject to protection under LP Policy OPEN 2, MUGS 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPOs not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>RECREATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MHMT19 - Land at Hanley road, Malvern Wells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to B4209 Hanley Road and Woodfarm Road an unclassified highway. Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from Woodfarm Road to serve this development site would be acceptable. Due to the convoluted nature of the junction between B4209 Hanley Road / Rothwell Road and Green Lane access to serve the site directly from B4209 Hanley Road will be resisted on grounds of highway safety. Individual direct accesses to properties served off both B4209 Hanley Road subject to adequate turning facilities being provided and Woodfarm Road would be considered acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent-surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, on the Wells Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, facilities on the Wells Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site is in AONB- very large- mainly open, but with strong hedgerows/ hedgerow trees on most boundaries. Site slopes up from west downwards to the east and is quite exposed from road. Largescale development in AONB inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>MHMT24 - Stocks Farm Newland - Part of strategic allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>See MHMT 32 for comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Adjacent to LP MUGS 2 at Newland Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>High sensitivity - County Arch comments: In area of RB ceramic production area and has distinctive open character which requires further HLC assessment. Forms coherent group with MHMT32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The site is adjacent to the MHMT32 site at Newland and can form part of a strategic allocation, providing scope for access to the area via the A49 roundabout here. There are no overriding landscape, ecology constraints.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Site</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHMT30- Land at QinetiQ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? Site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
<td>The access arrangements to this site and their impact on the surrounding network will be affected by the land use allocation within this site. Currently Qinetiq enjoy three points of access, to the west from St Andrews Road, the north from Geraldine Road and the south off Longridge Road. Our main concern with the development of this site is that there should not be any resulting increase in traffic along Geraldine Road due to the existing community uses found in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>The access arrangements to this site and their impact on the surrounding network will be affected by the land use allocation within this site. Currently Qinetiq enjoy three points of access, to the west from St Andrews Road, the north from Geraldine Road and the south off Longridge Road. Our main concern with the development of this site is that there should not be any resulting increase in traffic along Geraldine Road due to the existing community uses found in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located within a flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located within a flood zone.</td>
<td>The access arrangements to this site and their impact on the surrounding network will be affected by the land use allocation within this site. Currently Qinetiq enjoy three points of access, to the west from St Andrews Road, the north from Geraldine Road and the south off Longridge Road. Our main concern with the development of this site is that there should not be any resulting increase in traffic along Geraldine Road due to the existing community uses found in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area.</td>
<td>The access arrangements to this site and their impact on the surrounding network will be affected by the land use allocation within this site. Currently Qinetiq enjoy three points of access, to the west from St Andrews Road, the north from Geraldine Road and the south off Longridge Road. Our main concern with the development of this site is that there should not be any resulting increase in traffic along Geraldine Road due to the existing community uses found in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Arch comments - Prehistoric, Roman &amp; 20 C remains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjacent to any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjacent to any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjacent to any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjacent to any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjacent to any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjacent to any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjacent to any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjacent to any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield site in sustainable location nr local schools, shops and services. Can help deliver mixed employment/ housing uses and rationalize site to deliver jobs and homes.</td>
<td>Brownfield site in sustainable location nr local schools, shops and services. Can help deliver mixed employment/ housing uses and rationalize site to deliver jobs and homes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MHMT32 - Land off Lower Howsell Road (strategic allocation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</th>
<th>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The site in question forms part of the Strategic Site Allocation along with site MHMT24 known as Newlands Malvern. At meetings that have taken place with prospective developers of this site, the Highway Authority’s position has been clearly stated that no access to the site will be permitted from Lower Howsell Road and that the only means of accessing the site is from the A449 Worcester Road. This will involve improvements/changes to the Townsend Way roundabout in order to form a fourth arm to serve the development site or for it to be replaced with a signalised junction. The principle of both solutions are being currently investigated. There are problems with third party landownership to overcome and without these being resolved no suitable access arrangement will be possible as I believe all other options have been explored. The size of the development will have to be assessed in terms of its impact on the surrounding highway network and further a field along the A449/A4440 corridors. The development will also have to deliver improved sustainable links to the surrounding Malvern area for walking, cycling and public transport, the latter extending to encompass connections with other transport hubs in Malvern and Worcester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sewerage and Water supply adequate? | No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water |
| Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. | Site would not compromise designated areas within vicinity of site |
| Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No? | NO |
| The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. | Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland. |
| Sewerage and Water supply adequate? | No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water |
| Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. | Site would not compromise designated areas within vicinity of site |
| Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No? | NO |
| The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. | Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Can deliver sustainable urban extension for mixed uses on edge of Malvern. Accessible to local shops and employment. No overiding landscape or ecology issues.
**MHMT36 - Brooklands, Mayfield Road**

### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</th>
<th>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Our view is that the site should form part of the Malvern East strategic development site and it would not be helpful for it's design and implementation to be considered in isolation from the overall strategic site. Any decisions on highway access and circulation may prejudice such decisions relating to the wider area. The site has only a frontage to Mayfield Road at which point it is one way in a northerly direction. If the site were to be developed in isolation, then the traffic impact on the surrounding highway network would be significant due to the lengthy convoluted route that would have to be negotiated in order to access the site. Individual direct access to properties fronting Mayfield Road may be acceptable as this would be few in number and therefore the traffic impact reduced. However, it is our opinion that this site should not be developed unless it is done so in conjunction with Malvern East strategic development site. A public right of way crosses the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

| Sewerage and Water supply adequate? | No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water |
| Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. | No designated areas within vicinity of site |
| Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? | NO |
| The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. | Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland. |
| There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | |
| There is no significant net loss of protected open space? | |
| There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? | |
| There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s). | |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. | |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. | |
| There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. | |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. | |
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. | |
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow. | Drainage/ surface water needs further investigation |
| The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer). | |
| Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. | |
| Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer) | |
| Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance. | |
| Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? | |

| Site ruled in or out of SWDP | Out |

**Summary**

ACCESS/DRAINAGE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Site</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHMT37 - Land just South of Sherrards Road ( Better description is just south of Madresfield Road/ N of Moat Crescent)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has to the north a frontage to C2260 Madersfield Road, however highway records show that there is third party land between the highway and site boundaries. The assumption being that this is land owned by Malvern Hills Conservators. Subject to land ownership issues being resolved a junction design complying with design standards, would allow a single point of access from C2260 Madersfield Road to serve this development. There appears to be no other means of accessing this site. Subject to land ownership issues, individual direct accesses to properties served off C2260 Madersfield Road would be considered acceptable. Having identified that access to this land is feasible subject to landownership, the impact that the development will have on the highway network is considered to be detrimental to users and highway safety. This impact will especially apply to traffic using the C2102 linking B4211 Guarford Road to A449 Worcester Road via Madersfield Village and various junctions along B4208 Pickersleigh Road. Without significant mitigation works to overcome these issues development on this site should be opposed. A public right of way crosses the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - Barnards Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>ACCESS : Access would require third party Conservator's land along Madresfield Road. - Any development should be kept back and screened from the Madresfield Road because of landscape value of this route into Malvern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site no frontage to a public highway, but could be developed in conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with site MHHT08 (see comments). To the west of the site Shenstone Close gives</td>
<td>with site MHHT08 (see comments). To the west of the site Shenstone Close gives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to a private parking court and STW Pumping Station, which does abut the</td>
<td>access to a private parking court and STW Pumping Station, which does abut the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site and consideration may be given to utilising this as a means of access.</td>
<td>site and consideration may be given to utilising this as a means of access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the narrow width between Nos 8 and 9 (Shenstone Close) and the impact</td>
<td>Given the narrow width between Nos 8 and 9 (Shenstone Close) and the impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the development would have on the surrounding highway network both locally</td>
<td>the development would have on the surrounding highway network both locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and as identified in Site MHMT37 this option will be strongly resisted. This</td>
<td>and as identified in Site MHMT37 this option will be strongly resisted. This</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site in our opinion cannot be satisfactorily accessed.</td>
<td>site in our opinion cannot be satisfactorily accessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Close to SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>ACCESS/BIODIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Site</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHMT41- Playing field, Green Lane, Malvern Wells-The Abbey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to B4209 Hanley Road and Rothwell Road an unclassified highway. Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4209 Hanley Road to serve this development site would be acceptable. Due to the convoluted nature of the junction between B4209 Hanley Road / Rothwell Road and Green Lane access to the site directly from Rothwell Road will be resisted on grounds of highway safety. Individual direct accesses to properties served off both B4209 Hanley Road subject to adequate turning facilities being provided and Rothwell Road would be considered acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Footpaths and informal paths cross the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Adj to MUGS 2 but not within site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features, Bio-diversity assessment maybe required as site is currently meadow with variety of flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Group TPO now in place on trees along boundary of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy D317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>The belt of trees along boundary gives a very green feel to the entrance to Malvern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>1 in 30 shallow on various parts of the site. Needs FRA and drainage strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.</td>
<td>Yes, on the Worcester Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, on the Worcester Road for school and shop etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td><strong>In</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has to the south a frontage to B4211 Guarlford Road and to the east a frontage to C2102. Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4211 to serve this development site could be acceptable, but is likely to require land owned by Malvern Hills Conservators. This will restrict development potential to a maximum of 100 units unless a secondary access is provided. The frontage to C2102 due to its close proximity to a double bend is not considered to be suitable support an access arrangement. Individual direct accesses to properties served off B4211 Guarlford Road and C2102 subject to adequate turning facilities would be considered acceptable. Having identified that access to this land is feasible, the impact that the development will have on the highway network is considered to be detrimental to users and highway safety. This impact will especially apply to traffic using the C2102 linking B4211 Guarlford Road to A449 Worcester Road via Madersfield Village and various junctions in Barnards Green and along B4208 Pickersleigh Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>This site is an ex SWS (Grove Meadow SO84/02) and still has high grassland wildlife value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Site adj to residential development and farmland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>This site is an ex SWS (Grove Meadow(SO84/02) and still has high grassland wildlife value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** ACCESS/ LANDSCAPE/ECOLOGY- Would require access over Conservators land.
**SHLAA Site** | **MHMT45 - Land East of Mayfield Road**
---|---
Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA). | Availability unknown
Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone. | Site not within defined Flood Zone
Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | The site in question forms part of the Malvern East strategic development site known as Mayfield Road. At meetings that have taken place with prospective developers of this site, the Highway Authority’s has clearly stated that no access to the site will be permitted directly from Mayfield Road or Madesfield Road and that the only means of accessing the site is from B4208 Townsend Way. This will involve improvements / realignment and widening to Mayfield Road and its junction with Townsend Way including the possibility of a new roundabout dependant upon the level of development agreed. There are problems with third party landownership to overcome and without these being resolved no suitable access arrangement will be possible. The size of the development will have to assessed in terms of its impact on the surrounding highway network and further a field along the B4208 / A449 / A4440 corridors. The development will also have to deliver improved sustainable links to the surrounding Malvern area for walking, cycling and public transport, the latter extending to encompass connections with other transport hubs in Malvern and Worcester. Several public rights of way cross the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary** | EXTENSION INTO OPEN COUNTRYSIDE - LANDSCAPE/ACCESS- Would require access over Conservators land, and extend development into open countryside in an area of sensitive landscape. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>SHLAA Site</strong></th>
<th><strong>MHMT49 - Land off Bronsil Drive</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Upper Howsell Road is in our opinion inadequate to serve any development without improvement. It suffers from on street car parking, it is narrow in places, existing junctions are substandard and the road is a bus route which also serves the Dyson Perrins School. The footways are narrow and may not be continuous along both sides of the road. Junior Schools are located in Somers Park Road and Church Road so pedestrian routes along this road must be a major consideration. Should development of this site be promoted then the developer will be required to assess and mitigate against the impact the development will have on junctions in the immediate vicinity of the site with the scope being extended to included junctions beyond the site in order to properly assess the development impact, the following junctions should be considered as an absolute minimum - Upper Howsell Road / Somers Park Avenue / Church Road / Howsell Road - Church Road / Lower Howsell Road - Lower Howsell Road / Worcester Road (A449) and Leigh Sinton Road / A4103.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>In area of RB ceramic production area and largely intact locally distinctiveHLC. Forms a coherent unit with MHMT47 &amp; MHMT09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANDSCAPE/ACCESS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site forms part of the Malvern east strategic development site known as Mayfield Road, but can only be developed in conjunction with Site MHTH45, (see comments on accessibility).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>LANDSCAPE/ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLHAA Site</td>
<td>MHMT50 - Land North of Broadlands Road/ Sayers Avenue (Cales Farm) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has no frontage to a public highway, there is however an existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>track leading from the site to Broadlands Drive over which a public right of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>way runs. The width of the existing track is inadequate to provide a suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>means of accessing the site. Broadlands Drive from which this track takes its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access is in part an unsurfaced unadopted highway. Notwithstanding any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improvements that third parties may have or are obliged to undertake to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>junction of Sayers Avenue and Leigh Sinton Road the surrounding highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>network is considered inadequate without further improvements capable of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accommodating traffic generated by this development. This site <strong>should not</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be promoted as there is no suitable means of accessing the development area,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the roads leading to the site are inadequate in their current form to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accommodate increased traffic flows and the traffic impact will have a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>detrimental impact on the surrounding highway network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site/ Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no state distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>ACCESS/LANDSCAPE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>ACCESS/UNVIABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No designated areas within vicinity of site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The road to the west fronting this site is not an adopted public highway, the assumption being it is privately owned by the Housing Association,. Therefore there is in our opinion no suitable access to serve this development site unless this road were to be brought up to adoptable standards and offered for adoption as part of this development site. Dependant upon the level of development the traffic impact on the surrounding highway network could be considered detrimental to existing users therefore any developer will have to demonstrate what mitigation works are required to offset additional traffic impact, this could included junctions along Poolbrook Road and within Barnards Green.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sewerage plant in close proximity - Site in Cordon Sanitaire- full odour assessment required</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The road to the west fronting this site is not an adopted public highway, the assumption being it is privately owned by the Housing Association,. Therefore there is in our opinion no suitable access to serve this development site unless this road were to be brought up to adoptable standards and offered for adoption as part of this development site. Dependant upon the level of development the traffic impact on the surrounding highway network could be considered detrimental to existing users therefore any developer will have to demonstrate what mitigation works are required to offset additional traffic impact, this could include junctions along Poolbrook Road and within Barnards Green.</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td><strong>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM, however dips and hollows on the site may be of archaeological interest</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of any of the specified features</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site. Possible impacts on mature trees within and neighbouring the site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no net loss of forest (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Check impact with Landscape Section as the site has mature hedgerows and a number of notable trees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 in 30 shallow on parts of the site. Local flood risk is possible (SFRA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream,dock etc); Quarrying of sand and clay, operation of sand and gravel pits. Low - Phase 1 with application</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes - Barnards Green</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes - Barnards Green</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>ACCESS/DRAINAGE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>1 in 30 shallow on parts of the site.  Local flood risk is possible (SFRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Ruled out site not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHLAA Site - MHMT54 - Poolbrook School Buildings Bluebell Close
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>MHMT55 - Homestead, Halfkey Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to Halfkey Road an unclassified public highway. Due to the size of the site, only individual direct accesses to properties served off Halfkey Road would be considered acceptable. Some improvements to increase the width of the adjoining carriageway and provide a suitable footway across the site frontage will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes - residential/agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes site within Significant Gap - STGAP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no visual impact of future development lessened although existing buildings are only one storey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>1 in 200 shallow on parts of Half Key Rd adj to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Brown field site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).</td>
<td>No evidence supplied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - along Leigh Sinton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - high school/recreation field &amp; Link Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Small brownfield site adjacent to settlement boundary. In Significant Gap but already developed (green houses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to B4211 Church Street. Direct access to the site will be compromised by the close proximity of the junction between Church Street and Avenue Road. Therefore due to the size of the site, only individual direct accesses to properties served off B4211Church Street would be considered acceptable subject to adequate turning facilities being provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - commercial/residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is situated within the Malvern Town Centre Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Not immediately adj to, but near to listed buildings within Church Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy D317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>The site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>The site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Brown field site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No evidence supplied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - Great Malvern, immediately adjacent on Church Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - Great Malvern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Brownfield site within settlement boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Site</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHMT58 - Land to the rear of 12 Priory Road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood Zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to Priory Road an unclassified public highway. Direct access to the site will be compromised by the close proximity of the junction between Priory Road and Clarence Road. Therefore due to the size of the site individual direct accesses to properties served off Priory Road would be considered acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - commercial/recreation/residential. Site within primary/secondary employment zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is situated within the Malvern Town Centre Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Yes, 14-16 Priory Road, adjacent to site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>1 in 200 shallow across the site &amp; across Priory Road into car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Brown field site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No evidence supplied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - Great Malvern, adjacent on Church Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - Great Malvern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Small site but "infill" character. Conservation area but within built environment- not viewable from priory Park except from adjacent footpath. Back of site higher but seen in context of Splash building, development not an issue. Access very narrow and may be difficult- existing properties pleasant- could retain and build 3-4 more behind, or demolish one of existing to improve access, although existing properties are attractive design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>MHMT59 - Primary School, Lydes Road -</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>No longer available</td>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to B4208</td>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pickersleigh Road and Lydes Road an</td>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unclassified public highway. Direct</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access to the site from Pickersleigh</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road whilst acceptable subject to</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>junction design complying with current</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>design standards may be compromised</td>
<td>Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by the difference in level between the</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>site and adjoining carriageway. Whilst</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lydes Road is one way in a north</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>easterly direction, the traffic</td>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impact from any development will be</td>
<td>a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over a greater area. However a single</td>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>point of access from Lydes Road</td>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subject to design complying with current</td>
<td>Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>design standards is considered the</td>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>best means of developing this site.</td>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual direct accesses to properties served off Lydes Road would be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>considered acceptable.</td>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>DEPENDS ON REPLACEMENT FACILITY - NO LONGER AVAILABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>SHLAA Site</td>
<td>MHMT61 - Land off Mayfield Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The site has a frontage to Mayfield Road at which point it is one way in a northerly direction. If the site were to be accessed from Mayfield Road, then the traffic impact on the surrounding highway network would be significant due to the lengthy convoluted route that would have to be negotiated in order to access the site. Individual direct access to properties fronting Mayfield Road may be acceptable as this would be few in number and therefore the traffic impact reduced. The site also has to the north west a frontage with Elgar Avenue, subject to a junction design complying with current design standards a single point of access would be considered acceptable to serve the development site. The development of this site should however be restricted due to what the traffic impact will have on the Elgar Estate road network which is restricted to access only. The developer will be required to demonstrate how mitigation works will alleviate the impact development will have. Individual direct access to properties fronting Elgar Avenue would be acceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential/recreational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Yes - site is allocated open space - OPEN 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features. Although adjacent to the urban area the site is characterised as being of the principal timbered farmlands landscape type. Development in this location would therefore be contrary to some of the key characteristics of the landscape type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site. Development would mean a loss of an important community resource Some tree constraints are present on the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Mature hedgerows identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>1 in 30 shallow across the site extending across Brooklands and Maybrook. Local flood risk is possible (SFRA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No evidence supplied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - Barnards Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - Barnards Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Floodrisk/ Drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MHMT63 - Youth Centre site, Albert Road South -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>SHLAA Site</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g through SHLAA</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
<td>Ruled out site/not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some pre planning discussions have been undertaken on this site for both residential use and extension to the adjacent college. The existing access to the College is considered suitable to serve any future extension and there appears to be sufficient frontage to form a separate access to serve a residential development to the north of the existing access. However, potential problems with on site levels were observed that would have to be overcome in order to meet highway requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - educational/residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site not subject to protection under LP Policy CNT13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CNT13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap</td>
<td>The site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CNT13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Yes group TPO on eastern boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer)</td>
<td>1 in 30 shallow across building frontage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Brownfield site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No evidence supplied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - Great Malvern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - Great Malvern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Ruled out site/not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MAJOR CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowners have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA)</td>
<td><strong>BUILT OUT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Planning consent granted for 14 Affordable Houses on this site during 2010. Access arrangements have been agreed prior to consent. (MH10/000007/FUL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Site</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHMT65 - Former Health Centre, Victoria Road</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site has a frontage to Avenue Road an unclassified public highway.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct access to the site will be compromised by the close proximity of the</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junction into The Council Offices at Priory Lodge. Therefore due to the</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size of the site only individual direct accesses to properties served off Pri</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ory Road would be considered acceptable.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Ruled out site not available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>MHMT75 - Land at Woodend Lane, Upper Welland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Other than the existing access to Woodend Farm off C2221 Upper Welland Road, this site has no frontage to a public highway. The width of the existing access together with visibility restrictions, is inadequate to provide a suitable means of accessing the site. The access to Woodend Farm has a public right of way running over it. To the west of the site a frontage to Chase Road is indicated, whilst Chase Road is an unclassified highway the limits of adoption do not extend as far as the site frontage. Across the site frontage is a public right of way linking Chase Road with Assarts Road. This site should not be promoted as there is no suitable means of accessing the development area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>MHMT78 - 155/157 Wells Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to A449 Wells Road. Due to the size of the site individual direct accesses to properties served off A449 Wells Road could be considered acceptable subject to adequate turning facilities being provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Ruled out/not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT79 - Land to East of Stocks Lane, Malvern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to C2206 Stocks Lane. Subject to junction design complying with current design standards, single point of access serving the site from Stocks lane would be acceptable. Individual accesses directly serving properties would be acceptable also. The site is crossed by a public right of way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - res/agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Y - PROW 282 runs across site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>There are no TPOs on the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Surface water flooding on Stocks Lane and to east of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Open countryside location- would extend development into open countryside away from main built development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Site</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHMT81 - Land at Hayslan Avenue, Malvern</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Planning consent granted for 12 Houses on this site during 2010. Access arrangements have been agreed prior to consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Planning permission already granted on the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA Site</th>
<th>MHMT82 - Land off Upper Welland Road -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to C2221 Upper Welland Road and a private road known as Watery Lane. Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from C2221 Upper Welland Road to serve this development site would be acceptable. The junction of Watery Lane and C2221 Upper Welland Road will need improvements if this were to be adapted to serve the site. Individual direct accesses to properties served off C2221 Upper Welland Road would be considered acceptable subject to adequate turning facilities being provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>LANDSCAPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>MHMT83 Former Hillstone School, Abbey Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Planning application for C2 Care Home currently under consideration. Access arrangements and contributions requirements have been identified and submitted to Planning Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Planning permission already granted on the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to C2221 Upper Welland Road. Due to the size of the site and the existing road alignment, individual direct accesses to properties served off C2221 Upper Welland Road would be considered acceptable subject to adequate turning facilities being provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>10% High - 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN/FLOOD RISK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT60 - Morgan Works, Pickersleigh Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT SITE, DEPENDS ON REPLACEMENT FACILITY BEING PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/No, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geographical Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access and visibility requirements are considered acceptable from the existing access, however due to the close proximity of the existing Spring Lane junction, further examination is recommended before this site is allocated. It may be a possibility that remodelling of the junction to provide direct access to the development site could be a consideration worth pursuing. A public right of way runs across the site and along the access road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Commercial - Spring Lane Estate &amp; residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes site is protected under LP Policy CN13 and is a MUGS site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within a Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes - to east of site - 1:20 deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Yes - to east of site - 1:20 deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No - recreation land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes bus stops on Spring Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes Malvern Link facilities &amp; employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Recreation- No acceptable alternative provision has been demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

**Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g through SHLAA.**

Allocated site in Local Plan

**Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.**

Site not within defined Flood Zone

**Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**

Site not within specified distance for either facility

**The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**

The existing access on to St Andrews Road is a suitable location in order to form any new access to this site, any other position will be restricted by the brow of the hill. The site forms part of the greater QinetiQ strategic site allocation for which traffic distribution has been highlighted as a potential issue. The development of this site will impact immediately upon the Barnards Green roundabout and all junctions in between.

**Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**

No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

**Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**

No designated areas within vicinity of site

**Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**

NO

**The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.**

Commercial/residential

**There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**

Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CNT13

**There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**

Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area

**There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).**

There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site

**There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**

The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM

**There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**

The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features

**There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**

Group TPO on site

**There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**

The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17

**There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**

N/A

**The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).**

Low risk - drainage strategy required

**Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**

Brownfield

**Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).**

No information provided

### OTHER CRITERIA

**Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.**

Yes - St Andrews Road & Barnards Green

**Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**

Yes - Barnards Green

**Site ruled in or out of SWDP**

Out

**Summary**

Planning permission already granted on the site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA Site</strong></th>
<th><strong>Local Plan allocation H13 Barracks Stores, QinetiQ, St. Andrews Road</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Allocated site in Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Previously planning consent was granted on this site for residential development. A prerequisite to the granting of consent was the signalisation of the junction between St Andrews Road / Court Road / Thirlstone Road and the site entrance. I understand that there were some landownership issues which have now been overcome. Therefore any future development proposals on this site will be subject to the same access requirements. The site forms part of the greater QinetiQ strategic site allocation for which traffic distribution has been highlighted as a potential issue. The development of this site will impact immediately upon the Barnards Green roundabout and all junctions in between.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Commercial/residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Group TPO/protected hedgerow on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>1 in 200 shallow on Thurlestone Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - Barnards Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - Barnards Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Planning permission already granted on the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>Local Plan allocation H04 Former Carpenter’s Arms, Lower Howsell Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Allocated site in Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The site is located on the inside of a bend along Lower Howsell Road which will restrict any visibility requirements associated with new access points. The removal of the front boundary wall and widening of the narrow footway across the site frontage will help overcome these issues. Mid point across the site frontage Lower Howsell Road narrows but is still 6.5m wide. If the development of the site were restricted to frontage development on to Lower Howsell Road only, as identified as requirement with the adjacent allotment site and the footway across the site frontage widened, development of the site could be accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Group TPO on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>SFRA identified flood risk. Full FRA and drainage strategy required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - Malvern Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - Malvern Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Planning permission already granted on the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Site</strong></td>
<td><strong>Local Plan allocation H06 165-171 Newtown Road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Allocated site in Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Whilst the existing garage is served off Newtown Road, the formation of a new access to serve the development site off this road may be restricted by the numerous parked cars that were witnessed in the near locality. Whilst it is appreciated that some may be associated with the garage issue, a veterinary practice and apartment block were observed opposite which may contribute to the car parking problems. The formation of a junction with an associated traffic regulation order may also overcome the issues but may be unpopular with local residents. The site also has an existing access point on to Nursery Road and whilst directly opposite Larchfield Close may prove to be a better option for accessing the site due to the quieter nature of the road network. Newtown Road is a classified Road which supports a regular bus service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No information provided. Likely to be issues raised due to previous use of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - Link Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - Link Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>SITE ALLOCATION - LOCAL PLAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tenbury Wells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>MRTW01 - Land opposite Morningside</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from Oldwood Road, A4112, to serve this development site would be acceptable. The vertical and horizontal alignment of Morningside is substandard and visibility at its junction with Oldwood road and Berrington Road is restricted and any accesses onto this road will be resisted in the interests of highway safety. A public right of way crosses the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - agri land &amp; housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>On edge of Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site but full trees survey would be required to identify trees worthy of protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Roadside hedgerows are worthy of protection to define boundaries of the site. Full survey required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>1 in 200 shallow across site and runs along Bog Lane. FRA required and drainage strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No information on this site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, off Oldwood Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - Secondary &amp; Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP In</td>
<td>Site not within but close to Conservation Area - very undulating and exposed site with stream running through centre. Need to examine impact on green corridor and public right of way that crosses site. Scope for limited road frontage development along Oldwood Road away from junction with Morningside, that reflects recent planning permission for affordable dwellings on land on Oldwood Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Site not within but close to Conservation Area - very undulating and exposed site with stream running through centre. Need to examine impact on green corridor and public right of way that crosses site. Scope for limited road frontage development along Oldwood Road away from junction with Morningside, that reflects recent planning permission for affordable dwellings on land on Oldwood Road.
### SHLAA site reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Criteria</th>
<th>Other Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access from The Oaklands to serve this development site would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acceptable. The development of this site may require a change of priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at the junction of The Oaklands with The Crescent. A public right of way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>crosses the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>Yes - agri land &amp; housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes - agri land &amp; housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>No information on this site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
<td>No information on this site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contaminated land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Yes - off Oldwood Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, off Oldwood Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from</td>
<td>Yes, off Oldwood Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, off Oldwood Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Yes - Secondary &amp; Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site is visually prominent, with rising ground to summit, bisected by public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>footpath. It is surrounded by housing development, some of which is quite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recent i.e. The Oaklands. CHA consider the site can be accessed from The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oaklands. There are further more suitable sites which can provide for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenbury’s housing needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAJOR CRITERIA**

**OTHER CRITERIA**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHTW08 - Land off Oldwood Road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Comments not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential/agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Footpath runs along western boundary of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No information on this site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Surface water drainage issues affect part of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No information on this site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, off Oldwood Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - Secondary School &amp; town centre services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Large extensive pasture land with hedgerow boundaries, ground slopes away to westwards to watercourse and right of way. Open structure of landscape, provides rural setting and backdrop to affordable housing scheme and further development to west would be out of scale and detract from the open rural setting.
**SHLAA site reference** | **MHTW09 - Land at The Haven, Oldwood Road**  
---|---  
Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA). | Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period  
Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone. | Site not within defined Flood Zone  
Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | Site not within specified distance for either facility  
The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. | This site should be developed in conjunction with MHTW14, which subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from Oldwood Road, A4112, to serve both development sites would be acceptable. Developing the site on its own would preclude access to site MHTW14 due to the lack of site frontage preventing a safe junction spacing to serve each site. Individual accesses to serve properties off A4112 will be resisted on highway safety grounds. A public right of way crosses the site.  
Sewerage and Water supply adequate? | No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water  
Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. | No designated areas within vicinity of site  
Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? | No  
The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. | Yes - secondary school & farmland/residential  
There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | Footpath adjacent to site  
There are no significant net loss of protected open space? | Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13  
There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? | Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area  
There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s). | There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site  
There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. | The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM  
There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. | The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features  
There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. | No TPOs within or adjacent to the site  
There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. | The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17  
There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. | N/A  
There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow. | Roadside hedgerows are worthy of protection to define boundaries of the site. Full survey required.  
The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so is there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it. | No surface water issues detected. However FRA required and drainage strategy.  
Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. | Grade 3 on the ALC Map  
Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. | Not apparent on GIS map  
Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? | Yes, off Oldwood Road  
Yes/No If no stats distance. | No TPOs within or adjacent to the site  
Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? | Yes - Secondary & Primary School  
Site ruled in or out of SWDP | In  
**Summary** | Fairly level site on edge of settlement on Oldwood Road, would consolidate housing in this part of the town with footpath access to town centre facilities & shared access with Wheeler Orchard. Needs to be developed in conjunction with MHTW14 to establish a safe vehicular access.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>MHTW12 - Land adj Westfield Bungalow, Berrington Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood Zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No comments received - new site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - agr &amp; residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Needs to be checked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Not apparent on GIS map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Limited facilities exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Limited facilities exist within this distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Ruled out due to location and scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>MHTW13 - Land to south of Berrington Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No comments received - new site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/ surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - agri &amp; residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy ON13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Needs to be checked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Not apparent on GIS map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Limited facilities exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Limited facilities exist within this distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Ruled out due to location and scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site within Flood Zone 3a or 3b</td>
<td>Yes, off Oldwood Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway</td>
<td>This site would be best developed in conjunction with MHTW09, which subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from Oldwood Road, A4112, to serve both development sites would be acceptable. Developing the site on its own would preclude access to site MHTW09 due to the lack of site frontage preventing a safe junction spacing to serve each site. Individual accesses to serve properties off A4112 will be resisted on highway safety grounds. The site has a frontage to Wheeler Orchard and we have been approached to consider up grading the private drive serving numbers 60, 62 63 and 65 Wheelers Orchard in order to form an adoptable access to in to the site. Whilst an access may be physically achievable and Wheelers Orchard approach road being 4.8m in width is acceptable, the visibility at junction of the two Wheelers Orchard roads, Wheelers Orchard and The Crescent and The Crescent and Bromyard Road (northern junction) are substandard. The lower end of Wheelers Close reduces in width to be 4m this coupled with its alignment prevents two vehicles to pass simultaneously. Consequently we would oppose access being taken to serve this site from these roads. If the developer were to resolve all of these issues our design standards would restrict the development to a maximum of 100 houses being served off a cul-de-sac, as the roads in question already serve 65 houses the new development will be restricted to a maximum of 35units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - school playing field &amp; agri/residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy GN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site: Local Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features. However, there are at least two water bodies within/immediately neighbouring the site, of potential ecological importance which should be considered a development constraint. The ground, because of the small scale nature of the fields is unlikely to have been cultivated i.e. remained as pasture for an extended period of time raising the potential ecological value of the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy GS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Any development of the site would override the &quot;small-scale&quot; landscape with its somewhat degraded pattern of hedged fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Yes pond adj to site with some surface water drainage issues across site and boundary to Wheeler Orchard.FRA required and drainage strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Not apparent on GIS map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Yes, off Oldwood Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - Secondary &amp; Primary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Fairly discreet site contained by hedgerows and adjacent to school playing field and Wheeler Orchard. Site would be best developed in conjunction with MHTW09, to achieve a dual access point of access from Oldwood Road and Wheeler Orchard. Surface water issues need to be addressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>MHTW15 - Land adj Ivy House, Oldwood Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from A4112 Oldwood Road to serve this development site would be acceptable, this would however restrict development potential to less than 100 units. Individual direct accesses to properties served off A4112 Oldwood Road will be resisted on grounds of highway safety. Access to serve the site directly from Salt Box Lane will also be resisted on grounds of highway safety, however with some improvement to provide a constant width of carriageway of 4.8m across the site frontage and new footway provision would permit the consideration of frontage development along this lane. An alternative arrangement to accessing this site may be to divert Salt Box lane into the site and to then use the existing junction as a means of accessing the development site. This will be subject to satisfactorily achieving the required visibility standards from the junction as it was observed that a brow in the alignment near to Hillcrest may be restrictive. A public right of way crosses the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - agricultural land/residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>The presence of veteran ash pollards in the hedgerow neighbouring the public footpath across the site (runs north-south) coupled with the hedgerow’s presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>The hedgerow network is largely intact within this proposed site, reflecting the small-scale nature of the area’s landscape type (settled farmlands with pastoral land use). It is difficult to see how this would survive any development of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on the ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Not apparent on GIS map - check site opposite at Callows Grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, off Oldwood Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - Secondary &amp; Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Ruled out due to location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>MHTW16 Land adjacent Kyrewood Road, Greenhill Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Adj to SWS River Kyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No - residential/agri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Adj to SWS River Kyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No - residential/agri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Adj to SWS River Kyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No - residential/agri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Adj to SWS River Kyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No - residential/agri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Adj to SWS River Kyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No - residential/agri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Adj to SWS River Kyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No - residential/agri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Adj to SWS River Kyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No - residential/agri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Adj to SWS River Kyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No - residential/agri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Adj to SWS River Kyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No - residential/agri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>MHTH08 - The Old Post Office (0.09HA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>There is no hazardous pipeline or gas compression station in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Subject to access being taken from Greenfields Road and not Welland Road, frontage development would be considered acceptable. If a more ambitious development is being considered such as an apartment development then the location of any access would have to be seriously considered due to the close proximity of the junction between Greenfields Road and Welland Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No designated area adjoining or in vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>None - brownfield site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduling Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>None indicated on GIS Contamination Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes, within 400m - Upton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Limited facilities in Tunnel Hill. It is within 800m of public open space and community centre and about 400m from the local health centre, further facilities in Upton can be reached on foot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Too small for allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>MITH10 - Land off Greenfields Road (0.84HA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>There is no hazardous pipeline or gas compression station in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The site fronts an unclassified public highway and subject to the design complying with current design standards a single point of access to serve the development site will be acceptable. If the development were to be restricted along the site frontage of the unclassified road, then individual accesses to properties would also be acceptable. Some improvements to increase the carriageway width and provide a new footway across the site frontage will be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No designated area adjoining or in vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - residential/agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>A footpath runs along the boundary of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)?</strong></td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features however there is a pond within the site which may have some ecological significance together with a number of trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>Mature hedgerows around site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event on the north part of the site. This also affects site frontage onto Greenfields Lane quite severely. Flood risk assessment and drainage strategy would be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>None indicated on GIS Contamination Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes, within 400m - Upton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Limited facilities in Tunnel Hill. It is within 800m of public open space and community centre and about 1km from the local health centre, further facilities in Upton can be reached on foot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Site adjoins edge of settlement and would re-enforce development along Greenfields Lane; Tunnel Hill has no settlement boundary. Reduced density due to access, drainage issues at 20 dph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary:

- Site adjoins edge of settlement and would re-enforce development along Greenfields Lane; Tunnel Hill has no settlement boundary. Reduced density due to access, drainage issues at 20 dph.
Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.
The site is not within defined flood zones.

Site not within specified distance for either facility.
The site is not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b.

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.
The site fronts an unclassified highway linking the A4104 with the A38 and runs through the village of Ryall. This road is restricted in terms of access to prevent rat-running and any development proposals for the whole will have to mitigate against any potential impact on the to major junctions at either end of this road. Subject to design complying with current design standards a single point of access off this unclassified road to serve this development site would be acceptable. The potential to extend Hill View Gardens in to the site may exist, but the highway limits do not extend as far as the site boundary, so a ransom situation may exist. Also development accessed via this route will be restricted in terms of numbers to 100 which will include those already served off the Woodlands and Hill View Gardens. If development was to be restricted along the site frontage then individual accesses to properties would also be acceptable.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate?

No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.

No known sites adjoining or in vicinity

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?

No

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.

Site adjacent to residential uses/agriculture

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?

Site not subject to any open space protection

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?

Site is not within or adjoining a CA

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).

Northern part of site adjoins curtilage of listed building

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

No SAM in vicinity of the site

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.

No designated area adjoining or in vicinity of the site

There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.

No TPOs on the site. Some potential for landscape gain through re-planting of hedges removed at some point in the past and tree planting (secondary characteristics of landscape type)

There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.

Site not within Local Plan Significant Gap

There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.

No designated ancient woodland adjoining site

There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.

Although only small, the ditch running parallel with the hedge raises its level of importance with regard to the Hedgerow Regulations

The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.

Incidence of surface water flooding adjoining west boundary of site and to south and east of site (MHHG03). Flood risk assessment and drainage strategy would be required.

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.

Site is Grade 3

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.

No observations made

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.

Within 400m of regular services Upton-Worcester

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?

No local services, nearest Upton town approximately 1.5km

Site ruled in or out of SWDP

In

Summary

Only western half of site avoiding low ridgeline suitable for development. The reduced site relates well to the existing built up area with residential development to the north and south at 20 dph.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th><strong>MHHH05 Land to east of Ryall Chase, Holly Green</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Floodplain crosses road, directly adj to site but is not within the defined flood zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>We have MAJOR concerns over accessing this site from the A4104. We believe that visibility requirements both at a new junction and in terms of forward visibility cannot be fully achieved and without this any access will be considered unsafe. Consideration should be given to developing this site in conjunction with MHHG06 if suitable access arrangements can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>SSSI located at Upton Ham but unlikely to have an impact on this site as quite some distance away. The pond at the northern corner of the site is of possible ecological value both as an individual site and as part of the larger pond network in the area. There are at least 5 other water bodies within a 250 m radius increasing the likelihood of reptiles being in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Site adjacent to residential uses/agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>There is a public footpath running south west to north-east to the north-west of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site not subject to any open space protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjoining a CA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No measurable impact on setting of listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No SAM in vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No designated area adjoining or in vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs on the site. The scrubby area at the western corner of the plot will be of some ecological value. The area contains two aging walnuts (potential bat habitat) and the remnants of a cherry orchard (?). The poplars in this area are considered to be incongruous with their rural location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Site not within Local Plan Significant Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No designated ancient woodland adjoining site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>The historic hedgerow field boundary pattern in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site has all but been eroded by alterations to field boundaries and development in its vicinity. The site offers little opportunity to restore lost hedgerows on their original lines other than on the site's north-eastern boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Incidence of surface water flooding on Upton Road adjacent to site. No further information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Site is Grade 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No information on GIS records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Within 400m of regular services Upton-Worcester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? Yes/No</td>
<td>No local services, nearest Upton town approximately 1.5km.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Ruled out due to access issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MAJOR CRITERIA**

- **Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).**
  - Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period

- **Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.**
  - Site not within specified distance for either facility

- **Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**
  - Site not within specified distance for either facility

- **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**
  - Whilst this site is identified as Court Lane it appears not to have a frontage to this road. As it abuts site MHHG05 it is assumed that the two sites are being promoted to be jointly developed with access taken through site MHHG05. If this is to be the case then we have MAJOR concerns over accessing this site from the A4104. We believe that visibility requirements both at a new junction and in terms of forward visibility cannot be fully achieved and without this any access will be considered unsafe. If this is not the case then the applicant needs to demonstrate he can provide access directly from Court Lane, in which case subject to improvements to widen Court lane and provide new footways, limited development may be considered, this may subject to design, be extend to including site MHHG05.

- **Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**
  - No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

- **Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**
  - SSSI located at Upton Ham but unlikely to have an impact on this site as quite some distance away.

- **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**
  - No

- **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.**
  - Site adjacent to residential uses/agriculture

- **Is there any adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**
  - No significant net loss of protected open space?
  - Site not subject to any open space protection

- **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**
  - Site is not within or adjoining a CA

- **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).**
  - No measurable impact on setting of listed buildings

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**
  - No SAM in vicinity of the site

- **There is no adverse impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**
  - No designated area adjoining or in vicinity of the site

- **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**
  - No TPOs on the site - No further information available.

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**
  - Site not within Local Plan Significant Gap

- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**
  - No designated ancient woodland adjoining site

- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.**
  - No further information available.

- **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.**
  - Incidence of surface water flooding on Upton Road. No further information available.

- **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**
  - Site is Grade 3

- **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.**
  - No information on GIS records

- **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.**
  - Within 400m of regular services Upton-Worcester

- **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**
  - No local services, nearest Upton town approximately 1.0km

- **Site ruled in or out of SWDP**
  - Out

**OTHER CRITERIA**

- **Site not subject to any open space protection?**
  - Site not within or adjoining a CA

- **There is no detrimental impact on listed buildings.**
  - No measurable impact on setting of listed buildings

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**
  - No SAM in vicinity of the site

- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**
  - No designated ancient woodland adjoining site

- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.**
  - No further information available.

- **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.**
  - Incidence of surface water flooding on Upton Road. No further information available.

- **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**
  - Site is Grade 3

- **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.**
  - No information on GIS records

- **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.**
  - Within 400m of regular services Upton-Worcester

- **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**
  - No local services, nearest Upton town approximately 1.0km

- **Summary**
  - Ruled out due to access issues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1 Villages</th>
<th>Abberley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>MHAB01 - The Orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4202 Clows Top Road to serve this development site would be acceptable, gradient of the site may restrict development potential to less than 30 units. To achieve the development potential of this site it should be developed in conjunction with Site MHAB03. A private drive, from The Common, serving a maximum of 6 dwellings would be allowed, subject to achieving the required gradient, visibility splays and storm water disposal arrangements. Vehicular accesses onto Churchfield Terrace will not be allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>This site is adjacent to SWS 76/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - Site adjacent to residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</strong></td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>This site is adjacent to SWS 76/16. 4. Scattered fruit trees on the site but of no great age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>No evidence of surface water flooding. Drainage strategy required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>No evidence of contamination provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</strong></td>
<td>Service 758 - Worcester - Tenbury. Long walk to bus stop at village shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Good access to a range of village facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Abberley Parish Plan 2008 - desire to support local services such as village public house, village hall etc. Support for affordable housing &amp; need for children's play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Sloping site but well located to village and lends itself to modest form of development on part of site fronting Clows Top Road. Site adj to Special Wildlife Site. Reduced site density required due to extreme topography of site on lower section fronting The Common and tapering of site to south. Highway requirements to serve only private drive would severely restrict density to serve a maximum of 6 dwellings subject to achieving the required gradient, visibility splays and storm water disposal arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has unknown ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. Subject to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from</td>
<td>**Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4202 Clows Top Road to serve this development site would be acceptable,</td>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gradient of the site may restrict development potential to less than 20 units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve the development potential of this site it should be developed</td>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in conjunction with Site MHAB01. A private drive, from The Common, serving</td>
<td>Yes/ No, please state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a maximum of 6 dwellings would be allowed, subject to achieving the required</td>
<td>Site adjacent to residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gradient, visibility splay and storm water disposal arrangements. Vehicular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accesses onto Churchfield Terrace will not be allowed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>Old Orchard and woodland of significant semi natural interest. This site is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.**</td>
<td>adjacent to SWS 76/16, but is also wooded and looks to be of significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt</strong></td>
<td>interest in its own right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/ No, please state.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.**</td>
<td>Yes/ No If no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
<td>Service 758 - Worcester - Tenbury. Long walk to bus stop at village shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contaminated land.**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?**</td>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good access to a range of village facilities</td>
<td>Abberley Parish Plan 2008 - desire to support local services such as village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>public house, village hall etc. Support for affordable housing &amp; need for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td>children’s play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Unknown ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>MHA805 - Land at Walshes Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4202 Clows Top Road to serve this development site would be acceptable, gradient of the site may restrict development potential to less than 30 units. Individual vehicular accesses onto Clows Top Road will be resisted on grounds of highway safety. Development of this site will require an extension of the existing 30mph speed limit and also a continuous footway between the site and Abberley Primary School. Further site survey work will need to be carried out to check road user speeds and the suitability of a new access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>No - part site adj sewerage works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy GS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>1 in 200 shallow, only affects lower part of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>No evidence of contamination provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Service 758 - Worcester - Tenbury. Long walk to bus stop at village shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Good access to a range of village facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Abberley Parish Plan 2008 - desire to support local services such as village public house, village hall etc. Support for affordable housing &amp; need for children's play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Development of this extensive sloping site on the northern edge of the settlement would encroach into the open countryside and seriously compromise the open character and setting of the village. Poor access &amp; most of site unsuitable due to open aspect of site on this northern approach to the village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SHLAA site reference**
MHAB07 - Land to west of Apostle Oak Cottage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access from A443 Stockton Road to serve this development site would be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable, gradient of the site may restrict development potential to less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than 45 units. Individual vehicular accesses onto Stockton Road will be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resisted on grounds of highway safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>check SFRSA and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evidence of surface water flooding. Drainage strategy required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No evidence of contamination provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance</td>
<td>Service 758 - Worcester - Tenbury Yes short walk to bus stop at village shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Abberley Parish Plan 2008 - desire to support local services such as village public house, village hall etc. Support for affordable housing &amp; need for children's play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloping site, but open character difficult to contain and prominently located on A443 Stockton Rd. Single point of access on A443 required by CHA, Restrict development towards lower slopes adjacent to The Common to maintain the openness of site (restricted to a smaller portion of land (approx. 0.3ha)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
<td>If this site were to developed in conjunction with SWDP23/1, then access to the whole site, subject to a suitable junction design would be preferred from B4202. Equally access from The Common would be acceptable to serve this site if it were to be developed separately. Site gradients may be an issue when considering adoptable access arrangements and further investigation is recommended before allocating this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>This site is adjacent to SWG 7/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt? Yes/No? Yes - Site adjacent to residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>This site is adjacent to SWG 7/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td>There are no TPOs within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
<td>Site is within the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>No evidence of surface water flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No evidence of contamination provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td>Service 758 - Worcester - Tenbury Yes short walk to bus stop at village shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td>Abberley Parish Plan 2008 - desire to support local services such as village public house, village hall etc. Support for affordable housing &amp; need for children's play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Sloping site and its development would not be a viable addition to current allocation without causing disruption to Clows Top Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Clifton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>MHCUT01- Land adj to Pound Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period - July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Without extensive off site works to Pound Lane to improve the width, lack of footways and drainage, any development proposals will be resisted. If development were to be restricted to the frontage along Pound Lane, then the same improvements listed earlier will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>There are no TPOs either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>No information supplied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Yes Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Multiple routes - 308 / 308F / 310 / 311, Clifton-upon-Teme - Martley - Lower Broadheath - Rushwick / Henwick - Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Good access to a range of village facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No parish plan identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Level site relates well to built up area, and opposite existing affordable housing scheme, contained by hedgerow boundary &amp; thus well screened. However without extensive access improvements to Pound Lane and associated drainage would be resisted as road is very narrow at this point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is not within specified distance for either facility.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Front part of the site has already been developed. Without extensive off site works to Pound Lane to improve the width, lack of footways and drainage any development proposals will be resisted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential/Agri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Access issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SHLAA site reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 1a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No parish plan identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Ruled out due to access issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>MHCUT04 - Land at Hope Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone. Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from Hope Lane to serve this development site would be acceptable. Individual vehicular accesses to properties fronting Hope Lane would be considered acceptable. Continuous footways required on both sides of Hope Lane between the site and The Village. A public right of way crosses the development site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.  The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. Yes - residential development, however there is a sewage works within close proximity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s). There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. Yes Grade 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc): Adjacent Sewage site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Multiple routes - 308 / 309 / 310 / 311, Clifton-upon-Teme - Martley - Lower Broadheath - Rushwick / Herwick - Worcester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan. No parish plan identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP Discreet site with some hedgerow screening, boundary adjoins sewage works. Footpath along site boundary links with Saxon Close. Part of site fronting Hope Lane could be suitable for development subject to singular point of access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Discreet site with some hedgerow screening, boundary adjoins sewage works. Footpath along site boundary links with Saxon Close. Part of site fronting Hope Lane could be suitable for development subject to singular point of access.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>MHCUT05 - Land adj Clifton Lodge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4204 to serve this development site would be acceptable. Individual vehicular accesses onto B4204 will be resisted on grounds of highway safety. Continuous footways required on both sides of B4204 between the site and The Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - residential development, playing fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</strong></td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Low risk. Surface water flooding affects part of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Yes Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>No information supplied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</strong></td>
<td>Multiple routes - 308 / 309 / 310 / 311, Clifton-upon-Teme - Martley - Lower Broadheath - Rushwick / Henwick - Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Good access to a range of village facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering/supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No parish plan identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This is an open site with little containment on a prominent approach to the eastern end of the village. Development would extend village in a linear form eastwards, and detract from the built up form and character of the main approach to village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4204 to serve this development site would be acceptable. Private drives, off B4204, serving a maximum of 6 dwellings would be allowed subject to gradient, visibility splays and storm water disposal arrangements. Continuous footways required on both sides of B4204 between the site and The Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>Yes - residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Yes Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Multiple routes - 208 / 307 / 310 / 311, Biffon-upon-Teyme - Marstall - Lower Broadheath - Rushwick / Henwick - Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Development of whole of site would represent a substantial and very visible extension of the northern approach to the village into open countryside and would seriously harm the character and setting of the village and the open characteristics of the rural area. It would be difficult to integrate development into village framework as site is so exposed or to contain boundaries due to scale &amp; openness of site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SHLAA site reference**
- MHCU07 - Land north of Hope lane

**Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).**
- Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period

**Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.**
- Site not within defined Flood Zone

**Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**
- Site not within specified distance for either facility

**The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**
- Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from Hope Lane to serve this development site would be acceptable. Individual vehicular accesses to properties fronting Hope Lane would be considered acceptable. Continuous footways required on both sides of Hope Lane between the site and The Village.

**Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**
- No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

**Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**
- No designated areas within vicinity of site

**Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**
- No

**The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.**
- Yes - residential development

**There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**
- Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13

**There is no significant net loss of protected open space?**
- Site is not within or adjacent to a conservation area

**There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**
- There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site

**There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**
- The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM

**There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**
- No TPOs within or adjacent to the site

**There is no detrimental impact on Sustainable Options (TPOs).**
- No TPOs within or adjacent to the site

**There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**
- The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17

**There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**
- There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site

**The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.**
- Low risk

**Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**
- Yes Grade 2

**Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.**
- Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc)

**Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?**
- Multiple routes - 308 / 309 / 311 / 311, Clifton-upon-Teme - Martley - Lower Broadheath - Rushwick / Henwick - Worcester

**Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**
- Good access to a range of village facilities

**Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.**
- No parish plan identified

**Summary**
- The existing development of a small affordable housing scheme has provided a very modest extension to this part of the village and a rounding off of development. Any further development to the west of Winnington Close would represent an outward encroachment into the open countryside which would detract from the rural character of the area. Site is slightly elevated from road and would not sit well in village framework due to openness of site. Hope Lane narrows at this point to a single track road which is an unsuitable access.
### Great Witney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>MHG/W3 - Land adj Coal yard &amp; adj to school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards single points off both A443 Worcester Road and A451 Stourport Road to serve this development site would be acceptable. Individual vehicular accesses onto Worcester Road and Stourport Road will be resisted on grounds of highway safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - site adj to school. All commercial uses on site to cease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is subject to protection under LP Policy CN13 (adj to)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>There are listed buildings but these are opposite to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No evidence of surface water flooding. Low risk. Flood risk assessment &amp; drainage strategy would be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Route 759 - Worcester Route 760 - Kidderminster (Hundred House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes to doctors surgery, primary school, village hall, post office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

Site with dual aspect prominently viewed from the Worcester Road and B4197, only part of site fronting Worcester Road (including brownfield site) would be suitable for development as land to north rises significantly and also would be significant in the landscape when viewed from Stourport Road (reduced site area to 1.5ha). Development would need to be very carefully designed and have low impact taking into account the open rural character of the area.
MHGW04 - Land to East of Surgery

Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate?

Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?

There is not significant net loss of protected open space?

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.

The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?

Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.

Site ruled in or out of SWDP

Summary

Site is very prominent in the immediate landscape and development of the site would be out of scale and would compromise the integrity and setting of the village framework. Access issues off B4197 Prominently viewed from the Worcester Road and B4197, this site is extensive and although relates to the village framework is very exposed and open when viewed from both routes through the village. It would be very difficult to contain part of the site due to its openness and lack of natural site boundaries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th>MHGW05 - Land adj Hundred House Hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>MHGW05 - Land adj Hundred House Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone?</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Development of the site will be resisted on highway safety grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - hotel &amp; car park, well screened by high conifer hedgerow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>1 in 200 shallow - only affects lower western part of paddock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Route 759 - Worcester Route 760 - Kidderminster (Hundred House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes to doctors surgery, primary school, village hall, post office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Access issues exist due to the close proximity of the junction with A443 & its development would be resisted on the grounds of highway safety and possibly compounding existing surface water drainage problems. Gently sloping paddock with roadside frontage but lacks connection with main part of village. Minor surface water drainage issues exist.
MHHA02 - Land opp Ladygo Lane - Part of MHHA14

Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g. through SHLAA).

Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone. Site not within defined Flood Zone

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? Site not within specified distance for either facility.

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from A443 to serve this development site would be acceptable. Vehicular accesses onto Greenhill Lane will not be allowed. Individual accesses onto A443 will be resisted on grounds of highway safety.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate? The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? No

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. Residential - electricity substation on part of site

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? The site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)? Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. Site wraps around rear of large garden to Windsor Cottage

There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17

There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. The site is not within adjacent to the site

There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site

There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow. Not examined by Landscape Officer

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. Grade 3 on ALC map

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance. 1:200 shallow affects north west corner of site & part to rear of Laurels

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. No evidence of contamination provided

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? Yes - school, shops, PO, PH

Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? Yes

Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan. Part in

Site ruled in or out of SWDP Please refer to MHHA14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>MHRA03 - Land opp old car showroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Duplicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point from A443 to serve this development site would be acceptable. Individual accesses onto A443 will resisted on grounds of highway safety. A private drive serving a maximum of 6 dwellings would be allowed from Heath Close subject to land ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - residential/farm land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy D317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>Not examined by Landscape Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>1:200 affects southern boundary of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Grade 2 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>No evidence of contamination provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</strong></td>
<td>Service 758 - Worcester-Hallow, Tenbury Wells from Royal Oak (Hallow) Service 294/295 - Kidderminster, Stourport and Worcester from Royal Oak (Hallow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Service 294/295 - Kidderminster, Stourport and Worcester from Royal Oak (Hallow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes - school, shops, PO, PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>Part in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Please refer to MHRA14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Part in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowne(r)s have clearly indicated that the site is available and can</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Without extensive off site works to Shoulton Lane and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hollow Lane to improve the width and lack of footways,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>any development proposals will be resisted. If</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development were to be restricted to the frontage along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulton Lane, then the same improvements listed earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes - Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td>solution to overcome it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>1:200 shallow affects land to east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>No - brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td>No evidence of contamination provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Service 758 - Worcester-Hallow, Tenbury Wells from Royal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community</td>
<td>Oak (Hallow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Service 294 /295 - Kidderminster, Stourport and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Worcecster from Royal Oak (Hallow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>MHHA08 - Land off Park Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Park Lane is a private street and is unsuitable to serve as a means of access to the development of this site. The site should be developed in conjunction with MHHA10. Individual accesses onto A443 will be resisted on grounds of highway safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Residential on Park Lane but any industrial activities at Braithwaites yard would need investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOS within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes impinges on the Significant gap LP Policy STGAP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Not examined by Landscape Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 2 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No evidence of contamination provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Service 758 - Worcester-Hallow, Tenbury Wells from Royal Oak (Hallow) Service 294 /295 - Kidderminster, Stourport and Worcester from Royal Oak (Hallow) - check distance, more than 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Check distant - could be outside for school etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Access Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site not submitted by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>applicant as part of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>specified distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>objection from Severn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Residential on Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Lane but any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>industrial activities at Braithwaites yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>would need investigation or cease if developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of any of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>The site is not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td>adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOS within or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes improves on the Significant gap LP Policy STRGAP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Not examined by Landscape Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check</td>
<td>1:200 shallow affects part of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No - brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
<td>Service 758 - Worcester-Hallow, Tenbury Wells from Royal Oak (Hallow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contaminated land.</td>
<td>Service 294 /295 - Kidderminster, Stourport and Worcester from Royal Oak (Hallow) - check distance, more than 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Check distant - could be outside for school etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service 294 /295 - Kidderminster, Stourport and Worcester from Royal Oak (Hallow) - check distance, more than 400m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site is established employment site and somewhat removed from village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>MHRA12 - Hallow Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No comments available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No - offices at Hallow Park would not affect residential development of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>There are public rights of way which are connected to this site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is within the Hallow Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>setting of Hallow Parish Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>90/0003/3/TPO - Group Order Lime trees on driveway to Hallow Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes impedes on the Significant gap LP Policy STGAP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Not examined by Landscape Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Part grade 2/3 on ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>No evidence of contamination provided but needs checked due to commercial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Service 758 - Worcester-Hallow, Tenbury Wells from Royal Oak (Hallow) Service 298 /295 - Kidderminster, Stourport and Worcester from Royal Oak (Hallow) - check distance, more than 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site would adversely affect the setting of Hallow Parish Church and the setting of the Hallow Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHA14 - Land to south of Greenhill Lane (Part of MHHA02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>period</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within specified distance for either facility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within defined Flood Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to design standards being met a single point of access on to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Road A433 would be acceptable. Individual accesses to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>properties would be opposed on grounds of highway safety. The provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of a new footway across the site frontage linking to the existing network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be sought. There are 4 public rights of way which cross the development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specified features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential along Green Hill Lane and fronting main road. Electrical sub-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station on part of site. Check location of gas main pipeline to see if it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affects part of site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are public rights of way which are connected to this site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single listed building - Windsor Cottage to north of site fronting main road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specified features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of LP Policy DS17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>overcome it.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:200 shallow affects part of site alongside road frontage. Low risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires flood risk assessment &amp; drainage strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part grade 2/3 on ALC Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evidence of contamination provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service 758 - Worcester-Hallow, Tenbury Wells from Royal Oak (Hallow)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service 294 /295 - Kidderminster, Stourport and Worcester from Royal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak (Hallow)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>proposed site?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - primary school, shops, well placed to village facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10%?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of site to south maybe suitable subject to formation of singular point of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vehicular access and careful containment of the site adjacent to right of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way to reflect the existing pattern of development within the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Part of site to south maybe suitable subject to formation of singular point of vehicular access and careful containment of the site adjacent to right of way to reflect the existing pattern of development within the village.
**Hanley Swan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>MHHS03 - Land between School &amp; Westmere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Duplicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site is within Flood Zone 1 (i.e. it is not fluvial zone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No known hazardous pipeline or gas compression station within 450 of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes. Planning consent granted for 9 properties on front part of site with access and off site improvements agreed off C2054 Welland Road. Agreed access arrangements would be sufficient to develop remainder of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No compatibility issues, Adjacent uses include residential dwellings, local school and open countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>None of the site is within a protected open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site/ Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No known designated areas likely to be affected by the development of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs on site. Mature oaks along boundary to south of site. Significant trees on northern boundary and in north-western corner of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Strategic Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No Ancient Woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Site is currently of limited value in terms of biodiversity other than hedges and hedgerow trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>GIS data suggests there is potential for surface water flooding on southern boundary, adjacent to the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 2 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Site has not been identified as containing contaminants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Nearest bus stop is 110m from centre of site. Nos. 363, 364, 377, 244 run daily bus services through Hanley Swan to Malvern and Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good range of local services in village and within 800m. Hanley Swan has several key facilities and services namely, a primary school, post office, village hall, public house, recreation ground and church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Hanley Castle Parish Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

See MHHS14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>MRN013 - Land at Yew Tree Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site is within Flood Zone 1 (i.e. it is not fluvial zone).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No known hazardous pipeline or gas compression station within 450 of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes however, subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4209 Roberts End to serve this development site would be acceptable. If the development were to be restricted to the frontage along Roberts End, then individual direct accesses to properties would be considered acceptable. A public right of way crosses the development site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No compatibility issues, Adjacent uses include residential dwellings and open countryside. This would represent partial backland development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>None of the site is within a protected open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument but High Archaeological interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No known designated areas likely to be affected by the development of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Strategic Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No Ancient Woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>High hedgerow at present helps to screen site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>GIS data suggests there is potential for surface water flooding within the site, immediately south of Yew Tree House. 1 in 30 Shallow and 1 in 200 Shallow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 2 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Site has not been identified as containing contaminants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If not stats distance.</td>
<td>Nearest bus stop is 400m from centre of site. Nos. 363, 364, 377, 344 run daily bus services through Hanley Swan to Malvern and Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good range of local services in village and within 800m. Hanley Swan has several key facilities and services namely, a primary school, post office, village hall, public house, recreation ground and church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Hanley Castle PC Parish Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The smaller part of the site (farm building complex) could be redeveloped sensitively utilising the existing access as this would reflect the built form and character of the village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SHLAA site reference**

MHHS14 - Land between Primary School & Westmere (adj MHHS03) 0.41Ha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site is within Flood Zone 1 (i.e. it is not fluvial zone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression</td>
<td>No known hazardous pipeline or gas compression station within 450 m of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station?</td>
<td>the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Due to the close proximity of the existing road junctions, between Welland Road / Pickers End and Welland Road / new development site fronting MHHS03, direct access to serve this development site from Welland Road is not appropriate. This site should be developed in association with development site MHHS03 using the existing access through the recently constructed development site. Individual accesses to serve properties fronting Welland Road will not be resisted, but the majority of the site to the rear should be developed in accordance with the above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated</td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential</td>
<td>No compatibility issues. Adjacent uses include residential dwellings, local school and open countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>None of the site is within a protected open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument but High Archaeological interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local</td>
<td>No known designated areas likely to be affected by the development of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs on site. Mature oaks along boundary to south of the site. Significant trees on northern boundary and in north-western corner of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Strategic Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No Ancient woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Native hedgerow is well established and has some biodiversity value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event</td>
<td>GIS data suggests there is potential for surface water flooding on southern boundary, adjacent to the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to</td>
<td>Grade 2 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>Site has not been identified as containing contaminants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td>Nearest bus stop is 110m from centre of site. Nos. 363, 364, 377, 244 run daily bus services through Hanley Swan to Malvern and Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Good range of local services in village and within 800m of Hanley Swan. Hanley Swan has several key facilities and services namely, a primary school, post office, village hall, public house, recreation ground and church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contamination land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
<td>Grade 2 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contaminated land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than</td>
<td>Hanley Castle PC Parish Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The adjacent site has been developed for nine dwellings. It is considered land adjacent to the north could be included. This would afford a more inclusive layout and design better related to the adjacent built form of the village. The mature hedgerow between the two sites would need further investigation of its biodiversity and landscape value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Lower part of site adjacent to R Severn within Flood Zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Single access point acceptable. 34-37 Kings Hill is a private drive which could be adapted to serve the whole site. Individual access points to frontage development also acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No compatibility issues, the site adjoins residential uses to the east of Kings Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>None of the site is within a protected open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Development of the site would have no detrimental impact on the significant gap between Kempsey and Worcester as defined under Malvern Hills District Local Plan Policy DS17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No Ancient Woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Site adjacent to recorded incidences, compatible with flood zone (see above). Drainage officer not consulted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 1 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Regular services on A38 200m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good range of local services in village and within 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Kempsey Parish Plan in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Prominent edge of village site sloping down to floodplain. Uncertainty over west boundary because of flood plain considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Small area on east part of site within Flood Zone 3 relating to Hatfield Brook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access off either Worcester Road or Brookend Lane would be acceptable, though access to Brookend Lane may be restricted by road alignment. Access for whole of site from The Limes would be resisted on grounds of unsuitable road network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No compatibility issues, the site adjoins residential uses at The Limes to the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>None of the site is within a protected open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No known designated areas likely to be affected by the development of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Site lies within the significant gap between Kempsey and Worcester as defined under Malvern Hills District Local Plan Policy OS17. The development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the gap in view of it's size, location and visibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No Ancient woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Incidences of sw flooding on east boundary, partially within centre of site and adjacent to A38 on west boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No</td>
<td>Site adjacent to A38 which has regular bus services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good range of local services in village and within 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Kempsey Parish Plan in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Site lies within the significant gap between Kempsey and Worcester as defined under Malvern Hills District Local Plan Policy OS17. The development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the gap in view of it's size, location and visibility.
MHKY04 - The Lawns

Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate?

Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?

There is no significant net loss of protected open space?

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.

There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.

There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.

There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.

The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.

Net contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?

Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.

Site ruled in or out of SWDP

Summary

SHLAA site reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHKY04 - The Lawns</td>
<td>Duplicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Single access point off A38 would be acceptable. The site could be utilised to access land at the rear of the site (MHKY21). No individual accesses permissible to A38 on grounds of highway safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No compatibility issues, the site adjoins residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>None of the site is within a protected open space as defined in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument however archaeological interest is HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No known designated areas likely to be affected by the development of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Yes Group TPO on site - 12/2/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Development of the site would have no detrimental impact on the significant gap between Kempsey and Worcester as defined under Malvern Hills District Local Plan Policy DS17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No Ancient Woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No incidences of flooding recorded for the site. Drainage officer not consulted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Site mostly non-agricultural land as residential institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No CLO observations made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Site is adjacent to A38 with regular bus services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good range of local services in village and within 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Kempsey Parish Plan in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>See MHKY21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHK09 - Land at Post Office Lane</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The inadequate Post Office Lane/Main Street junction, the lack of footpaths and the carriageway width and alignment restrict the potential development of the site. Insufficient frontage to Napleton Lane to form access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within Flood Zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The inadequate Post Office Lane/Main Street junction, the lack of footpaths and the carriageway width and alignment restrict the potential development of the site. Insufficient frontage to Napleton Lane to form access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within Flood Zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The inadequate Post Office Lane/Main Street junction, the lack of footpaths and the carriageway width and alignment restrict the potential development of the site. Insufficient frontage to Napleton Lane to form access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within Flood Zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The inadequate Post Office Lane/Main Street junction, the lack of footpaths and the carriageway width and alignment restrict the potential development of the site. Insufficient frontage to Napleton Lane to form access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within Flood Zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The inadequate Post Office Lane/Main Street junction, the lack of footpaths and the carriageway width and alignment restrict the potential development of the site. Insufficient frontage to Napleton Lane to form access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within Flood Zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The inadequate Post Office Lane/Main Street junction, the lack of footpaths and the carriageway width and alignment restrict the potential development of the site. Insufficient frontage to Napleton Lane to form access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within Flood Zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The inadequate Post Office Lane/Main Street junction, the lack of footpaths and the carriageway width and alignment restrict the potential development of the site. Insufficient frontage to Napleton Lane to form access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within Flood Zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The inadequate Post Office Lane/Main Street junction, the lack of footpaths and the carriageway width and alignment restrict the potential development of the site. Insufficient frontage to Napleton Lane to form access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within Flood Zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The inadequate Post Office Lane/Main Street junction, the lack of footpaths and the carriageway width and alignment restrict the potential development of the site. Insufficient frontage to Napleton Lane to form access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within Flood Zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The inadequate Post Office Lane/Main Street junction, the lack of footpaths and the carriageway width and alignment restrict the potential development of the site. Insufficient frontage to Napleton Lane to form access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within Flood Zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The inadequate Post Office Lane/Main Street junction, the lack of footpaths and the carriageway width and alignment restrict the potential development of the site. Insufficient frontage to Napleton Lane to form access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within Flood Zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>MHK16 &amp; 32 - Napleton Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s)</strong> have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).**</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Without extensive off site works to Napleton Lane to improve width, alignment, and lack of footways any development would be resisted. Any frontage development along Napleton Lane would require same improvements to be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>No compatibility issues, the site adjoins residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>None of the site is within a protected open space as defined in the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</strong></td>
<td>There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No known designated areas likely to be affected by the development of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No TPOs on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>Development of the site would have no detrimental impact on the significant gap between Kempsey and Worcester as defined under Malvern Hills District Local Plan Policy DS17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No Ancient Woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td>Minor incidences on part of site. Drainage officer not consulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>Grade 2 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td>Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Good range of local services in village and within 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Site is close to A38 with regular bus services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Kempley Parish Plan in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Yes/No. This is a site that is deemed to provide viable and acceptable accessibility services for the purposes of the Development Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Site currently has restricted access and would be difficult to improve alternative access via Bannuts Hill, however it is acknowledged that the agent has provided a transport statement and has confirmation from FHA that land could be provided to allow access so this may be possible but not confirmed by CHA. Development of site would detract from the rural setting of Napleton Lane and would begin to impact on the dispersed settlement pattern of the surrounding landscape.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>MHWY21- Land west of The Lawns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Single point of access from Main Street A38 would be acceptable if restricted to 100 units. If site developed in conjunction with MHKY04 then secondary access would be possible enabling 100+ units. No individual accesses to any frontage development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>No compatibility issues, the site adjoins residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>None of the site is within a protected open space as defined in the Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument however archaeological interest is HIGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No known designated areas likely to be affected by the development of this site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs on site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Development of the site would have no detrimental impact on the significant gap between Kempsey and Worcester as defined under Malvern Hills District Local Plan Policy DS17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No Ancient Woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Incidences of flooding within and adjacent to the site along Main Road and within part of site. However flood risk assessment required and drainage strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Mostly Grade 1 with exception of area around Bight Farm which is Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No observations made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Site is adjacent to A38 with regular bus services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes.No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Good range of local services in village and within 800m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Kempsey Parish Plan in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Development of the northern part of the site half defined by hedge line running W/E and Bight Farm would be acceptable and not have significant impact on the character and setting of this part of the village. Site can be accessed directly off A38 or via adjoining site known as The Lawns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHKY22- Land adj. Draycott Lodge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 490 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Single point of access from Main Street A38 would be acceptable. Land could be utilised to access land at the rear (MHKY16) but would be restricted to 100 units. No individual accesses to A38.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>No compatibility issues, the site adjoins residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is there a no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No of the site is within a protected open space as defined in the Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No known designated areas likely to be affected by the development of this site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No TPOs on site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>Development of the site would have no detrimental impact on the significant gap between Kempsey and Worcester as defined under Malvern Hills District Local Plan Policy DS17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No Ancient Woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td>Incidences of flooding within and adjacent to the site along Main Road and within part of site. Drainage officer not consulted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Mix of Grades 2 &amp; 3 on ALC map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Site is adjacent to A38 with regular bus services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Good range of local services in village and within 800m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Kempsey Parish Plan in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Open area in prominent location on approach to village. It’s development would be prominent visually and extend the village to the extent that it would impact on the character and setting of this part of the village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MHKY08 - Land at Clerkenleap**

Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

*Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period. It is located well outside the Kempsey defined settlement boundary and may be considered as part of the strategic site option relating to Worcester South.*

**Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.**

*Site not within Flood Zones*

**Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**

*No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.*

**The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**

*Existing access to site serving Clerkenleap Farm acceptable but would need to be adopted as public highway. No individual accesses to A38*

**Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**

*No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water*

**Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**

*No known designations within vicinity of the site*

**Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**

*No*

**The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.**

*Would need to check impact of any commercial activities adjacent to site*

**There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**

*None of the site is within a protected open space as defined in the Local Plan*

**There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**

*The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area*

**There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).**

*There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.*

**There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**

*The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument*

**There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**

*No known designated areas likely to be affected by the development of this site.*

**There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**

*No TPOs on site*

**There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**

*Site lies within the significant gap between Kempsey and Worcester as defined under Malvern Hills District Local Plan Policy D517.*

**There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**

*No Ancient Woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site*

**There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.**

*No information available*

**The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).**

*Minor surface water flooding at site entrance. Drainage officer not consulted.*

**Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**

*Grade 2 on ALC map*

**Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.**

*Information not available*

**Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.**

*Site is adjacent to A38 with regular bus services*

**Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**

*Good range of local services within 800m, mainly towards Worcester*

**Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.**

*Kempsey Parish Plan in place*

**Site ruled in or out of SWDP**

*Out*

**Summary**

*Site located well outside village, future use may be considered within context of Worcester South strategic site.*

---

**Table: MHKY08 - Land at Clerkenleap**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>MHKY08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can</strong></td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period. It is located well outside the Kempsey defined settlement boundary and may be considered as part of the strategic site option relating to Worcester South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Existing access to site serving Clerkenleap Farm acceptable but would need to be adopted as public highway. No individual accesses to A38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Would need to check impact of any commercial activities adjacent to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>None of the site is within a protected open space as defined in the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No known designated areas likely to be affected by the development of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No TPOs on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>Site lies within the significant gap between Kempsey and Worcester as defined under Malvern Hills District Local Plan Policy D517.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No Ancient Woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td>Minor surface water flooding at site entrance. Drainage officer not consulted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Grade 2 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Information not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Site is adjacent to A38 with regular bus services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Good range of local services within 800m, mainly towards Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Kempsey Parish Plan in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Site located well outside village, future use may be considered within context of Worcester South strategic site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SHLAA site reference**  
MHKY11 - Land R/O Florence Close

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Planning application 07/1728 (7 units) submitted and now approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone?</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Planning permission granted for 7 units with access and off site improvements agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No compatibility issues, the site adjoins residential uses to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>None of the site is within a protected open space as defined in the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No known designated areas likely to be affected by the development of this site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument however archaeological interest is HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No TPOs on site, only adj at The Lawns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Backland gardens site, not within Significant Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No Ancient woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Incidences of surface water flooding on Main Road could affect development of site. Drainage strategy required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Site is adjacent to A38 with regular bus services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good range of local services in village and within 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g., in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Kempsey Parish Plan in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site lies within existing settlement boundary/PP already granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLHAA site reference</td>
<td>MHKY29 Land adjoining Brook Close (0.26ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA), Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA Update 2012 and developable within plan period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Given that there would have been little substantial increase in traffic generation we had no objection to such a proposal subject to design. It is unclear whether or not this site is the same one or additional. The site plan shows a link through to a small cul-de-sac known as Brook Close to which it would appear there is insufficient land to form a suitable access which needs further investigation before this site is allocated. A site visit has shown that there exists a building which is assumed to be a sewer pumping station that would prevent access from Brook Close. If the issues relating to available land and the existing building can be overcome then we would have no objection to access being taken from Brook Close. Equally if the land identified earlier is additional to the site allocation then this to could be developed from Brook Close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Bell Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No compatibility issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>None of the site is within a protected open space as defined in the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No known designated areas likely to be affected by the development of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Development of the site would have no detrimental impact on the significant gap between Kempsey and Worcester as defined under Malvern Hills District Local Plan Policy DS17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No Ancient Woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No incidences of flooding recorded for the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Information not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Site is within walking distance of A38 with regular bus services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good range of local services in village and within 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Kempsey Parish Plan in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>There are issues to be overcome relating to the means of access from Brook Close and the sewage pumping station insitu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>MHKY33 - Land to south of Lawns (part of MHKY 21) (3.1ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA Update 2012 and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from A38 Main Street to serve this development site would be acceptable, this would however restrict development potential to less than 100 units. Individual direct accesses to properties served off A38 Main Street will be resisted on grounds of highway safety. There is a public right of way crossing the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>None of the site is within a protected open space as defined in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument however archaeological interest is HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No known designated areas likely to be affected by the development of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No TPOs on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>Development of the site would have no detrimental impact on the significant gap between Kempsey and Worcester as defined under Malvern Hills District Local Plan Policy DS17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No Ancient Woodland adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td>No incidences of flooding recorded for the site. However flood risk assessment required and drainage strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Site is within walking distance of A38 with regular bus services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Good range of local services in village and within 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Kempsey Parish Plan in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>See comments on MHKY21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Lower Broadheath**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th><strong>MHLB06 Land off B4024 (adj Hopton Cottage)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Planning consent granted for 6 dwellings on front part of site. (only historic outline now expired!!). Agreed access arrangements would be sufficient to develop remainder of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Nursery site to North West, with shared access- dwellings on either side on road frontage, and opposite- but low density, &quot;ribbon &quot; development.- However, site is open and grassy with edge of settlement/ rural character- site slopes upwards fro the road to the north east, and situated on a bend in the road. Despite previous historic permission, not a good site for development. Would make more sense if developed in association with adjacent nursery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no relevant impact to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>1:200 shallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No evidence of contamination provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Services 308 / 309 / 310 / 311- Martley to Worcester (Bell Inn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, just within threshold to village hall, school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Planning consent for 6 dwellings on frontage, however access could serve more. In planning terms would be better developed, if at all with adjacent nursery site to west.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</th>
<th>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design standards, a single point of access from Bell Lane to serve this development site would be acceptable. Vehicular accesses onto Partridge Lane will not be allowed. Individual accesses to properties fronting Martley Road would be considered acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Open flat site near heart of village. Dwellings to South West, South (on opp side of road) and to North East corner of site. Also quite modern dwellings visible across site to North East. Well contained with hedgerows/trees on most boundaries. Partridge Lane to South West more rural feel, but still contains this site. Scope to deliver the whole site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>1: 200 shallow - very small part of site on roadside frontage. Flood risk assessment would be required &amp; drainage strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Services 308 / 309 / 310 / 311: Martley to Worcester (Bell Inn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, within access to village hall, school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Site can be accessed as single point off Bell Lane. Site well contained with visible development to East. Also, large modern dwellings to North East helps to contain site. Close to village amenities of shop, pub and not far from school, church, hall. Open flat field, with many hedge trees on S.East road frontage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>MHLB07 South of Bell Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design standards, a single point of access from Bell Lane to serve this development site would be acceptable. Vehicular accesses onto Partridge Lane will not be allowed. Individual accesses to properties fronting Martley Road would be considered acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Open flat site near heart of village. Dwellings to South West, South (on opp side of road) and to North East corner of site. Also quite modern dwellings visible across site to North East. Well contained with hedgerows/trees on most boundaries. Partridge Lane to South West more rural feel, but still contains this site. Scope to deliver the whole site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>1: 200 shallow - very small part of site on roadside frontage. Flood risk assessment would be required &amp; drainage strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Services 308 / 309 / 310 / 311: Martley to Worcester (Bell Inn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, within access to village hall, school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Site can be accessed as single point off Bell Lane. Site well contained with visible development to East. Also, large modern dwellings to North East helps to contain site. Close to village amenities of shop, pub and not far from school, church, hall. Open flat field, with many hedge trees on S.East road frontage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SHLAA site reference

| Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA). | Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period |
| Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone. | Site not within defined Flood Zone |
| Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | Site not within specified distance for either facility |
| The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. | Subject to access design complying with design standards. Footways required between the site and Martley Road. |
| Sewerage and Water supply adequate? | No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water |
| Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | Site not within specified distance for either facility |
| Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone. | Site not within defined Flood Zone |
| The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. | Residential development to west of site, along road frontage, and opposite in both cases fairly low density. |
| There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | No |
| There is no significant net loss of protected open space? | Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13 |
| There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? | Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area |
| There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s). | There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. | The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM |
| There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. | No TPOs within or adjacent to the site |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. | The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS17 |
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. | There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site |
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow. | Need to check status of hedgerows & any bio-diversity issues |
| The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer). | 1:200 shallow on Peachley Lane - on part of site frontage. Drainage strategy required. |
| Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. | Grade 3 on ALC map |
| Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. | No evidence of contamination provided |
| Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance. | Services 308 / 309 / 310 / 311: Martley to Worcester (Bell Inn) |
| Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? | Yes, within access to village hall, school |

### OTHER CRITERIA

| Site ruled in or out of SWDP | In |

### Summary

Partly developed site, well contained for small development, possibly a courtyard development with access off Peachley Lane.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Criteria</th>
<th>Other Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHLB10 Strand Cottages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No objection to frontage development with individual access points onto Peachley Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Need to check status of hedgerows &amp; any bio-diversity issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No evidence of contamination provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Services 308 / 309 / 310 / 311: Martley to Worcester (Bell Inn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, within access to village hall, school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Overgrown site within long gap in frontage development, adjacent to settlement boundary. Pond on S.W boundary. Track along western boundary. Access acceptable for frontage development, would fill this gap along Peachley Lane- mixed type of dwellings to west east and south, would require footpath along frontage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Without extensive off site works to Hallow Lane to improve the width, lack of footways, and drainage, any development proposals will be resisted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No adverse impact - res devt only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHLB13 Land &amp; Buildings at Peachley Manor Farm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Group TPOs all along road frontage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>1:30 shallow, 1:200 shallow around farm buildings. Drainage strategy required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unknown Filled Ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Services 308 / 309 / 310 / 311-Marley to Worcester (Bell Inn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, edge of site within access to village hall, school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Beyond, and not adjacent to the settlement boundary in rural area with rural feel. Not well related to settlement, and would encroach into open countryside. Highways concerned about width of Hallow Lane, lack of footways, and drainage and unless resolved development should be resisted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from Bell Lane to serve this development site would be acceptable.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/No, please state type.</td>
<td>No adverse impact - res devt, farmland only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Footpath runs along boundary of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Group Order and hedgerow protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Conservation Area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Yes, protected hedgerow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Some surface water flooding along parts of Bell Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Services 308 / 309 / 310 / 311- Martley to Worcester (Bell Inn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, within access to village hall, school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site too far removed from settlement. Surface water drainage affects large part of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY02/3 - Land adj Crown Inn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>- Duplicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for other facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access to the site off the B4197 would be acceptable subject to design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standards being complied with if it were to be formed west of Mortlake Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is unclear whether or not the existing public house forms part of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development site therefore any development proposals should not result in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the loss of existing parking associated with this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Y - impact of Public house, garage &amp; car park needs further assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>but should not preclude development of site with mediation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Footpaths run along site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CR13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N - opposite Cons Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Jewry building is in close proximity to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td>specified features. There is a RIG near the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event</td>
<td>Yes - surface water issue and possible local flood risk. Flood risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it</td>
<td>assessment required plus drainage strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Grade 2 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>Grade not identified by Contaminated Land Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contaminated land.</td>
<td>308 / 309 / 310 / 311 - Martley to Worcester from St Peters Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>See MHMY15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Martley
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>MHMY15 - Land to rear of Crown Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for ether facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access to the site off the B4197 would be acceptable subject to design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standards being compiled with if it were to be formed west of Mortlake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>Y - impact of Public house &amp; car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>A right of way runs across the site but could be accommodated within the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Jewy building is in close proximity to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>No, it is not within a defined area as a Significant Gap under the terms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td>LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>specified features. There is a RIG near the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check</td>
<td>Yes - surface water issue (shallow). Yes - surface water issue and possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it</td>
<td>local flood risk. Flood risk assessment required plus drainage strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>Yes - surface water issue (shallow).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 2 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
<td>None identified by Contaminated Land Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contaminated land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>30B / 30T / 311- Marley to Worcester from St Peters Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Land to rear of PH Car park adjacent to edge of village &amp; Conservation Area,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjacent listed buildings needs careful design and landscaping, taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>account of right of way across site and hedgerow boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Singular point of access required by CHA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SHLAA site reference** | Site adj to Primary School  
---|---
**Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).** | Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period - duplicate  
**Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.** | Site not within defined Flood Zone  
**Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?** | Site not within specified distance for either facility  
**The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.** | Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4204 to serve this development. Due to location of the site to the schools a development of no more than 10 dwellings would be acceptable.  
**Sewerage and Water supply adequate?** | No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water  
**Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.** | No designated areas within vicinity of site  
**Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?** | No  
**The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.** | Y - via school car park  
**There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?** |  
**There is no significant net loss of protected open space?** | Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13  
**There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?** | Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area  
**There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?** | There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site  
**There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.** | The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM  
**There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.** | The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features  
**There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.** | Site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS17  
**There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.** | There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site but the trees do form part of a remnant orchard and their ecological value should be investigated  
**Other Criteria** |  
**Site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).** | No surface water issue identified  
**Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.** | Grade 3 on ALC map  
**Net contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.** | Unknown  
**Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.** | 308 / 309 / 310 / 311- Martley to Worcester from St Peters Drive  
**Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?** | Good access to a range of village facilities  
**Site ruled in or out of SWDP** | Out  
**Summary** | See MJMY14  

| SHLAA site reference | Site adj to Primary School  
---|---
| Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA). | Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period - duplicate  
| Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone. | Site not within defined Flood Zone  
| Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | Site not within specified distance for either facility  
| The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. | Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4204 to serve this development. Due to location of the site to the schools a development of no more than 10 dwellings would be acceptable.  
| Sewerage and Water supply adequate? | No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water  
| Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. | No designated areas within vicinity of site  
| Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? | No  
| The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. | Y - via school car park  
| There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? |  
| There is no significant net loss of protected open space? | Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13  
| There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? | Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area  
| There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)? | There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site  
| There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. | The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM  
| There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. | The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features  
| There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. | Site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS17  
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. | There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site but the trees do form part of a remnant orchard and their ecological value should be investigated  
| Other Criteria |  
| Site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer). | No surface water issue identified  
| Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. | Grade 3 on ALC map  
| Net contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. | Unknown  
| Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance. | 308 / 309 / 310 / 311- Martley to Worcester from St Peters Drive  
| Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? | Good access to a range of village facilities  
| Site ruled in or out of SWDP | Out  
| Summary | See MJMY14  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>MHRY04 - Land at Laugherne Villa (Taylors of Martley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The site has an existing access on to the Worcester Road B4204 which was previously used for commercial purposes and appears to still be used but on a much smaller scale for Coach storage and repair. The B4024 is derestricted across the site frontage therefore visibility splays of 2.4m x 203m in each direction will be required. To the left of the site entrance some 75m towards Martley speeds are restricted to 30mph. Approximate visibility measurements taken on site, which indicated that 100m towards Martley and 70m towards Worcester would achievable. It was also observed that when approaching the site entrance from Martley forward visibility is severely restricted on the inside of the bend, so vehicles waiting to turn right cannot do so safely. It is our considered opinion that it is not possible to form a safe access to serve this site for residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Site is mainly B8 (storage) &amp; it is likely that whole site would be redeveloped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Hedgerow in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Yes surface water issue to west of site (1 in 30 shallow).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC Map (brownfield site).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>308 / 309 / 310 / 311- Martley to Worcester from St Peters Drive No bus stop nearby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Poor, nearest facility 480m from site (school) Over 800m to village shop/PO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Ruled out due to access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>MHMY04 - Land at Laugherne Villa (Taylors of Martley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The site has an existing access on to the Worcester Road B4204 which was previously used for commercial purposes and appears to still be used but on a much smaller scale for Coach storage and repair. The B4024 is derestricted across the site frontage therefore visibility splays of 2.4m x 203m in each direction will be required. To the left of the site entrance some 75m towards Marley speeds are restricted to 30mph. Approximate visibility measurements taken on site, which indicated that 100m towards Marley and 70m towards Worcester would achievable. It was also observed that when approaching the site entrance from Marley forward visibility is severely restricted on the inside of the bend, so vehicles waiting to turn right cannot do so safely. It is our considered opinion that it is not possible to form a safe access to serve this site for residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>N - residential/open countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Hedgerow in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Yes - minor surface water flooding across the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>N/A - brownfield land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Limited access due to distance from facilities, closest to schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Ruled out due to access and location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State flood zone</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4204 to serve this development may be possible but would be subject to the following. Due to location of the site to the school’s entrance a development of no more than 10 dwellings would be acceptable. Near to the site frontage along the B4204 there is a brow in the road alignment which could restrict the visibility requirements for any new junction. This needs further investigation before this site is allocated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4204 to serve this development may be possible but would be subject to the following. Due to location of the site to the school’s entrance a development of no more than 10 dwellings would be acceptable. Near to the site frontage along the B4204 there is a brow in the road alignment which could restrict the visibility requirements for any new junction. This needs further investigation before this site is allocated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4204 to serve this development may be possible but would be subject to the following. Due to location of the site to the school’s entrance a development of no more than 10 dwellings would be acceptable. Near to the site frontage along the B4204 there is a brow in the road alignment which could restrict the visibility requirements for any new junction. This needs further investigation before this site is allocated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>N-providing car park to school can be relocated or accommodated suitably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site, however there is a remnant orchard, a priority habitat in the WBAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a significant gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site but contains remnant orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>None noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Orchard land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Reasonable access to a range of village facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHMY14 - Land at the Old Orchard, adj to Martley Primary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>There are access issues to address and ecological issues associated with the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate?

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)?

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.

There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.

There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.

There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.

There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?

Yes/No If no stats distance.

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?

Site ruled in or out of SWDP

Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>If this site was to be developed in conjunction with sites MHMY02 and 03 then access to the site off the B4197 would be acceptable subject to design standards being complied with if it were to be formed west of Mortlake Drive. It is unclear whether or not the existing public house forms part of the development site therefore any development proposals should not result in the lost of existing parking associated with this use, which will need to be compensated for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y - impact of Public house, garage &amp; car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is on the edge of the Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>Jewry building is in close proximity to site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>There is a RIG near the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a significant gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>There is an Ancient Hedgerow in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>None identified by Contaminated Land Register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Grade 2 on ALC map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>See comments above - MHMY15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>MHWD05 - Lawn Farm Drake St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone. Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from A4104 Drake Street to serve this development site would be acceptable, this would however restrict development potential to less than 100 units. Individual direct accesses to properties served off A4104 Drake Street could be considered subject to adequate turning facilities being provided. A public right of way crosses the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. Yes - residential/agricultural/retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s). There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features. SWS to east of site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer). 1 in 200 years occurrence along eastern agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. No known issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance. Yes - approx. 90m along Drake Street &amp; adjacent to Pheasant Inn on B4208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? Yes - 600m+ to primary school but no footpath provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>LOCATION - remote from village framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>MHWD06 - Land to rear of Welland House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has no frontage to a public highway, therefore it cannot be accessed without the means of third party land via Welland House. The existing junction serving development to the front of Welland House is considered unacceptable in its current form to serve further development, unless improvements are undertaken, which will involve third party land. Without improvements to this junction development on this site should not be considered. For the reasons identified, it will not be possible for this site to be developed in conjunction with site MHWD01. This site should not be promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - nursing home/residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CNT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes group TPO on poplars and others on site which might be at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Part of site in flood plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Landfill at Hazor field - Phase 1 and 2 with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - close proximity to primary school, shop, village hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary ACCESS/FLOOD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>MHWD07 - Land and buildings at Church Farm, Drake St</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).**
  - Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period

- **Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.**
  - Site not within defined Flood Zone

- **Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**
  - Site not within specified distance for either facility

- **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**
  - This site, in part, was considered previously and my comments are still applicable, "subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from A4104 Drake Street to serve this development site would be acceptable, this would however restrict development potential to less than 100 units. Individual direct accesses to properties served off A4104 Drake Street could be considered subject to adequate turning facilities being provided. A public right of way crosses the site." The site frontage on to Drake Street is not sufficient to allow two points of access and as there appears to be no other frontage to a public highway the above comments must be repeated.

- **Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**
  - No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

- **Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**
  - No designated areas within vicinity of site

- **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**
  - No

- **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.**
  - Yes - agricultural/holiday lets

- **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**
  - Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13

- **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**
  - Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area

- **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?**
  - There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**
  - The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**
  - Site is adj to Drake St Meadow - SWS

- **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**
  - No TPOs within or adjacent to the site

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**
  - The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy G317

- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**
  - N/A

- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.**
  - Site contains a number of mature native hedgerows containing the fields.

- **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).**
  - Some surface water flooding issues across site and close to roadside access.

- **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**
  - Grade 3

- **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.**
  - No information on this site

- **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.**
  - Yes - approx. 90m along Drake Street & adjacent to Pheasant Inn on B4208

- **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**
  - Proximity to facilities in village with single footpath

- **Site ruled in or out of SWDP**
  - No

**Summary**

[linked with MHWD05] SCALE/LOCATION - removed from village
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s)</strong> have clearly indicated that the site is available and can</td>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>MHWD09 - Land at Church Villa, Gloucester Road, Welland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access from B4208 to serve this development site would be acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>Yes site is adjacent to an SSSI (Mutlows Farm).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>Yes - former parish church, agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity,</td>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Site is subject to protection under LP Policy CNT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>The church is a listed buildings adjacent to the site and its setting could be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adversely affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>The site is also a traditional orchard which are considered a priority habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td>in the national Biodiversity Action Plan. This particular orchard is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>recognised in the traditional orchard inventory for England. Furthermore the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>site is in close proximity to a SSSI at Mutlows Orchard. This SSSI is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>designated because the flora present bears a direct relationship with it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>having been an orchard in the past. The proximity of this SSSI to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed site markedly raises the level of importance of retaining it as an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>orchard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs,</strong></td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site but see above comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a significant gap under the terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>Site recognized as traditional orchard and close to SSSI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>Mature hedgerow boundaries on roadside and around site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No information on this site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
<td>Adjacent to Pheasant Pub on B4208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contaminated land.</td>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If</td>
<td>Yes - close proximity to primary school/shop/village hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stats distance.</td>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposal site?</td>
<td>The development of the site could adversely affect the setting of the listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>building and the site is a priority habitat situated close to an SSI which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raises the ecological importance of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The development of the site could adversely affect the setting of the listed building and the site is a priority habitat situated close to an SSI which raises the ecological importance of the site.
**SHLAA site reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site not within defined Flood Zone, however its boundary is close to a water course.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td><strong>This is a site is a former Public House located to the east of the cross roads in the centre of the village. Given the previous use, the likelihood of any substantial increase in traffic generation is small. A new access will be required, the existing ones should be closed, the position of which will have to be carefully considered given the close proximity of the staggered cross roads and can only be taken from A4104. Individual frontage development to either the A4104 or the B4208 will be resisted on highway safety grounds.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No designated areas within vicinity of site.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Check proximity to pub car park if use is re-instated.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy 0113.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td><strong>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site. Although there are some trees within the body of the site they are all relatively young so should not be considered a constraint to development of the site.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy D917.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No known issues.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFR) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Some potential flooding issues on eastern boundary. Flood risk assessment and drainage strategy required and part of site may need to be excluded.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grade 3.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No information on this site.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adjacent to Pheasant Pub on B4208.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes - close proximity to primary school/shop/village hall.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>In.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

This is a site is a former Public House located to the east of the cross roads in the centre of the village. Part of car park could be redeveloped to provide modest housing scheme providing a suitable community use is retained and suitable flood alleviation/surface water drainage measures are taken. A new access will be required, the existing ones should be closed, the position of which will have to be carefully considered given the close proximity of the staggered cross roads and can only be taken from A4104.
## Category 2 Villages

### Bayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>MHBY01</th>
<th>Land adjoining Severne Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period,</strong> (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Without extensive off site works to the existing approach roads to improve the width, alignment and lack of footways, any development proposals will be resisted. If development were to be restricted to the frontages individual access would be acceptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Adjacent uses are residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CT13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>Yes within UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>Listed buildings adj to site but no significant impact as site is well screened.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>The site is adjacent to SAC. Possibilities for landscape gain through rejuvenation of existing hedges and incorporation of historic field boundaries into any development of the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td>Low risk. Drainage strategy would be required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>None identified by Contaminated Land Register</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - access to primary school, bus stop, village hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No parish plan identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Only northern part of site would be suitable adj to Severn Green affordable housing scheme. Rest of site should be safeguarded from development due to attractiveness of open setting and its prominence within the village. Site is further restricted by reduced width of access road and drainage issues. Impact of development on the Bayton Conservation area needs careful consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAJOR CRITERIA

#### OTHER CRITERIA

1. Low risk. Drainage strategy would be required.
2. Grade 3 on ALC map.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHBY02 Land at Clows Top Road</td>
<td>Site identified by local authority/parish council - ownership unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood Zone. Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. No comments available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate? No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. Adjacent uses are residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space? Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? N (adj South perimeter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer). Low risk. Drainage strategy would be required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. None identified by Contaminated Land Register</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? Yes - access to primary school, bus stop, village hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan. No parish plan identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Unknown ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHBW04 - Land adjacent to School</td>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipelines or compressor stations on or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Site not adjacent to designated area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>Site adjoins school and open farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>The site is not subject to any open space protection designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>The site is not subject to any open space protection designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>The site is not within or adjoining a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no Listed Buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, a Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No known designations within vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs either within or adjoining site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The Local Plan significant gap policy does not apply inBroadwas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Not in vicinity of Ancient Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Low risk. Drainage strategy would be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Site adjoins A44 Worcester-Bromyard Road which has regular bus services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Limited local services available but within 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>A small site which relates well to the fabric of the village and facilities. If developed would not extend built development into open countryside on the south side of the main road to any harmful degree. Highway access acceptable subject to junction design. Although mature hedge on road frontage it is likely that much of this would need to be removed in order to provide visibility splays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Callow End

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>MHCE01 - Bush Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access to the Old Bush Inn from the B4424 Upton Road is not adopted public highway, however a public right of way crosses it. It is considered that the upgrading of this road and access arrangements would in this instance be the best means of accessing the development site, subject to the junction layout complying with current design standards. If the development potential were to be restricted to frontage development only, then individual access to properties served of both the B4424 Upton Road and Bush Lane would be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes providing farming operations cease or are controlled on adjacent sites by planning condition (if under same ownership control)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There is a listed building adj to site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Significant surface water flooding issue on highway and around farm buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>N/A - brownfield land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No evidence of contamination provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - to PH &amp; Post Office/School/Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Part of site has extant PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The existing access to Wheatfield Court from B4424 Upton Road, is substandard and requires improvement in order to facilitate any development on this site. Its close proximity to a sharp bend south of the site and substandard visibility for vehicles emerging from the Court are compounded by the high wall which exists adjacent to the carriageway along the whole site frontage. It will be a minimum requirement for this wall to be removed or reduced in height (below 600mm) in order to satisfy any suitable access arrangements. This wall and the alignment of B4424 Upon Road will prevent individual accesses to properties being provided along the B4424 frontage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Bell Yes/ No?</td>
<td>Site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Group TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map but higher in terms of BMV land (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No evidence of contamination provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Yes available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - to PH &amp; Post Office/School/Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>This site could accommodate a conversion scheme/modest development but would need significant access improvements and the protection of trees/ecological issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: This site could accommodate a conversion scheme/modest development but would need significant access improvements and the protection of trees/ecological issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>MHCE05 - Stanbrook Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>To the south, the site has a frontage to an unnamed road which is a public highway. This road in terms of its alignment width and junction with the B4424 Upon Road is considered unsuitable to serve the whole development site. With improvements to allow two vehicles to pass and new footway improvements, individual accesses to serve properties along this frontage may be considered. To the north, the site fronts C2103 Jennett Tree Lane and B4424 Upon Road, at the junction of these two roads exists the current access which served the former Abbey. The existing access is not considered suitable to serve any new development proposals and should be closed as part of the site development. There is not sufficient frontage to form a suitable access on to B4424 Upton Road, therefore C2103 Jennett Tree Lane has the only frontage whereby a single point of access can be formed to serve the whole development site, subject to junction arrangements complying with current design standards. The site frontage to C2103 Jennett Tree Lane has a high wall running along its whole length which is situated immediately at the rear of the carriageway. In order to achieve suitable visibility the removal of large parts of this wall will be required. If the whole site were to be developed then an alternative access arrangement could be investigated by providing a roundabout at the junction of B4424 Upton Road and C2103 Jennett Tree Lane whereby a fourth arm could be designed to serve the site. This will require third party land as observations on site have indicated that design standards maybe difficult to achieve especially with regards approach visibility. Subject to the removal of the wall along the C2103 Jennett Tree Lane frontage, individual direct access to properties would be acceptable, however due to the alignment of B4424 Upton Road individual access points along this frontage will be resisted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - surrounding farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy C/N13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Yes, Stanbrook Abbey is Grade II* and its setting could be affected by proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM but affects listed structures within the Abbey &amp; its grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Significant surface water flooding on highway, especially upon eastern boundary of site on B4424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map (small part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low - phase 1 maybe required (on site of cemetery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - to PH &amp; Post Office/School/Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>There are access and surface water drainage issues. The development (depending on its location) could have an adverse effect on the setting of a grade II* building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from C2065 to serve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this development site would be acceptable. If development were to be restricted to the frontage along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the C2065 then individual direct accesses to properties would be considered acceptable. a public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>right of way crosses the development site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Residential/open countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Right of way crosses rear of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No surface water issue identified - low risk. Drainage strategy required. Anecdotal evidence of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>drainage problems within the village affecting the garage/hall site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Yes - Post office, shop &amp; garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td>An increase of 17+5 dwellings = 11%. This takes account of a potential allocation in Wyre Forest as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than</td>
<td>neighbouring local authority area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%?</td>
<td>No parish plan identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td>A modest scheme acceptable subject to resolving mains drainage issues and a satisfactory means of access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>A modest scheme acceptable subject to resolving mains drainage issues and a satisfactory means of access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clows Top**

MHCT01 - Land adjacent Highbrae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from C2065 to serve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this development site would be acceptable. If development were to be restricted to the frontage along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the C2065 then individual direct accesses to properties would be considered acceptable. a public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>right of way crosses the development site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Residential/open countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Right of way crosses rear of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No surface water issue identified - low risk. Drainage strategy required. Anecdotal evidence of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>drainage problems within the village affecting the garage/hall site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Yes - Post office, shop &amp; garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td>An increase of 17+5 dwellings = 11%. This takes account of a potential allocation in Wyre Forest as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than</td>
<td>neighbouring local authority area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%?</td>
<td>No parish plan identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td>A modest scheme acceptable subject to resolving mains drainage issues and a satisfactory means of access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Leigh Sinton**

**SHLAA site reference**  
MHL02 - Land at Damson Orchard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Not within a flood zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>There is no hazardous pipeline or gas compression station in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes, however does not directly abut a public highway. The site requires 3rd party land and there is a potential ransom issue. Access track to the south west of site is private over which a public right of way runs. Notwithstanding the substandard nature of the junction on to the A4103, any improvements to this track in order to access the site will be resisted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, the site is flanked to the east and south by residential properties. The north and west is open countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Does not impact a designated wildlife and/or landscape site. However the site is an ageing orchard. A visual assessment gives the impression of an orchard in poor condition however it is recognised that this could harbour high values of biodiversity. Specialist opinion required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Not contaminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes the site is within 800m of the local pub and shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The site has not got an acceptable means of access and has bio-diversity issues that need to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>MHLS03/MHLS10 Land off Kiln Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Not within a flood zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>There is no hazardous pipeline or gas compression station in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Two concerns raised with this potential allocation, both of which could be overcome but would require more information before the site could be judged to be acceptable. Firstly the close proximity of junction to Lower Howsell Road. Ideally we would be looking for a junction spacing of 50m or a junction arrangement that incorporates both junction, preferably a roundabout which given the level of development proposed may make it unviable. Secondly, the B4503 is seen. Secondly, the B4503 is seen and based upon recently traffic modelling work the potential for considerable delays at this junction have been identified if improvements are not undertaken. This development proposal will only serve to exacerbate the situation. We would therefore be seeking for the developer to mitigate against his impact at this junction which could be significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, site is flanked by housing and open countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The majority of the site is of little ecological note. There is however a portion of the site to the east, neighbouring the B4503 that contains a fair sized orchard. Judging from the natural regeneration of trees (ash, field maple, elder) that has occurred in amongst the apple trees, the orchard is no longer in production. That is not to say however that it could not become productive once more. This portion of the site has some ecological value though this might be possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site. All individual trees of note within the boundaries of the site have been heavily damaged by grazing animals; almost certainly horses. Their long term prospects are therefore not good. The largest of the trees (oak) has suffered approximately 80% damage in terms of its basal circumference. These trees should therefore not be considered constraints to development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>The hedge neighbouring the B4503 has a relatively limited mix of hedgerow species (hawthorn, field maple and ash). Although its age is difficult to ascertain this boundary has obviously existed for many years. The raises the hedge’s level of importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Some surface water flooding along Leigh Sinton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes the site is within 800m of the local pub and shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Development of the site would extend the village southwards into open countryside impinging upon the strategic gap for Malvern. Site would have to be accessed from Malvern Road and if suitable, would be subject to single access and junction onto Malvern/ Worcester Road which would need to be examined and mitigation works identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA). Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.

Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone?

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? There is no hazardous pipeline or gas compression station in the vicinity of the site.

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. As this site does not abut a public highway it is now being promoted in association with site allocation MHLS08, without this collaboration with the adjacent site, third party land is required in order to achieve suitable access. Comments made concerning accessing site MHLS08 are considered suitable to serve as a means of accessing both sites should they be developed as one. If the two sites are not developed together then the access serving Sinton Farm House is not considered suitable as means of accessing the site and would be resisted on grounds of highway safety given its geometry and close proximity to the junction of Stocks Lane and the A4103. Without development site MHLS08 there is no suitable means of accessing this development site. It is strongly recommended that before this site is allocated the junction between B4035 and A4103 needs to be assessed and mitigation works identified, there is a lot of local opposition to improvements to this junction.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate? No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No? No

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. Yes, telephone exchange adjacent to site and residential development

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)? There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features

There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. No, however there are at least three significant trees on the north part of the site.

There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. The site is within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS18

There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site

The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer). The site has been subject to a surface water flooding event on the north part of the site.

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. Grade 2 and 3

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. Not contaminated

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance. Yes, within 400m

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? Yes the site is within 800m of the local pub and shop

Site ruled in or out of SWDP Out

Summary Site needs to be linked to MHLS08 as in isolation has no suitable means of access.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHLS07 - Land adjoining Elmhurst Farm (2.5ha)</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Not within a flood zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>There is no hazardous pipeline or gas compression station in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from A4103 to serve this development site would be acceptable, this would however restrict development potential to less than 100 units. Whilst the site is within the restricted speed limit, individual direct accesses to properties will be resisted, NO FRONTAGE DEVELOPMENT. There are two public rights of way crossing the site. It is strongly recommended that before this site is allocated the junction between B4035 and A4103 needs to be assessed and mitigation works identified, there is a lot of local opposition to improvements to this junction. There is a public right of way crossing the development site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, the site is surrounded by farmland/residential properties to north east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>There is no TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes the site is within 800m of the local pub and shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Site is prominently situated on edge of village on raised ground offering views from the Malverns and development of the site would be out of scale with the pattern of the village development and contrary to the dispersed settlement pattern of the landscape type of the area. The junction between B4035 and A4103 also needs to be assessed and mitigation works identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site is prominently situated on edge of village on raised ground offering views from the Malverns and development of the site would be out of scale with the pattern of the village development and contrary to the dispersed settlement pattern of the landscape type of the area. The junction between B4035 and A4103 also needs to be assessed and mitigation works identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>MHLS08 - Land adjoining Malvern Rd (1.67ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Not within a flood zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>There is no hazardous pipeline or gas compression station in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Subject to design standards being met a single point of access on to Leigh Sinton Road B4503 would be acceptable. Individual accesses to serve properties would be opposed on grounds of highway safety. The provision of a new footway across the site frontage linking to the existing network will be sought. It is strongly recommended that before this site is allocated the junction between B4035 and A4103 needs to be assessed and mitigation works identified, there is a lot of local opposition to improvements to this junction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>Yes, site adjacent to telephone kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes, site adjacent to telephone kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>The site is within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Grade 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes, within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes the site is within 800m of the local pub and shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Site would extend village southwards impinging on the strategic gap for Malvern. Site would have to be accessed from Malvern Road and if suitable, would be subject to single access and junction onto Malvern/ Worcester Road which would need to be examined and mitigation works identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>MHLS09 - Land adj Moat Farm Nursing Home, Stocks Lane (1.78ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, the site is adjacent to a nursing home and farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site (on opposite side of A4104).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Ancient moat within the site which maybe worthy of archaeological protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes the site is within 800m of the primary school but would require a controlled crossing point across the A4104.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of site requires major junction improvements and its scale and location would be out of character with the pattern of development in the village, additionally would have adverse impact on setting of listed building opposite (former school house).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Powick and Collets Green

**SHLAA site reference**  
MHPW02 - Off former Powick Hospital site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period Duplicate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Single point of access could serve the development subject to design to current standards. Individual accesses to properties would be acceptable if development restricted to frontage of site to Hospital lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas in vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Site adjacent to residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPO’s within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Needs further investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Yes, this is well-known land-fill site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no state distance.</td>
<td>Site located adjacent to A449 Worcester-Malvern Road and a high level of bus route provision. (Service No: 44).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**  
See MHPW15
### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Criteria</strong></th>
<th><strong>Information</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Development will increase right turn movement at the A449/Sparrowhall Lane junction. Either a one way traffic flow northwards, or a cul de sac arrangement and junction closure would be required. These would require Traffic Orders to be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Site adjacent to residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPO’s within or adjacent to the site. A single mature oak tree lies in eastern part of site but appears to be quite young and in decline so would not be a restriction to development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Existing hedgerow would need to be incorporated into the proposed layout, including a hedgerow running north south which is weak and could be reinstated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No surface water drainage issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No observations made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no Stats distance.</td>
<td>Site located adjacent to A449 Worcester-Malvern Road and a high level of bus route provision.(Service No: 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Criteria</strong></th>
<th><strong>Information</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Information</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s development would require alterations to traffic movement at A449/Sparrowhall Lane junction in order to avoid increase in right turning traffic. This alteration would require Traffic Orders to be implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to the design complying with current design standards a single point of access to serve the development site will be acceptable if it is taken from Hospital Lane. The potential impact of the development on the traffic signals at the junction of Hospital Lane and A449 will have to be assessed. Any direct access to serve either the site or individual accesses from the A449 will be resisted. If the development were to be restricted along the Hospital Lane site frontage, then individual accesses to properties would also be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas in vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Site adjacent to residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPO's within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No observations made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map - mainly brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>No surface water drainage issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map - mainly brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No observations made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Site located adjacent to A449 Worcester-Malvern Road and a high level of bus route provision. (Service No: 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The development of the site could prejudice the viability of the public house which is a community facility. Access would need to be off Hospital Lane and the potential impact of the development on the traffic signals at the junction of Hospital Lane and A449 would have to be assessed.
### MAJOR CRITERIA

#### Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).
- Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.

#### Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.
- Site not within defined Flood Zone

#### Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?
- Site not within specified distance for either facility

#### The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.
- Site fronts A449 and no direct access will be permitted. In highway terms site can only be developed in conjunction with Site MHPW04 Crown Inn site.

#### Sewerage and Water supply adequate?
- No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

#### Site not within specified distance for either facility
- No designated areas in vicinity of the site.

#### Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.
- Site not within Flood Zone

#### Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?
- No

#### The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.
- Site adjacent to public house and residential development

#### There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?
- Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13

#### There is no significant net loss of protected open space?
- Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area

#### There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).
- There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site

#### There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.
- The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.

#### There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.
- No TPO's within or adjacent to the site

#### There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.
- The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17

#### There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.
- There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site

#### There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.
- No information

#### The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).
- 1:200 shallow surface water drainage issue

#### Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.
- Grade 3 on ALC map

#### Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.
- No observations made

#### Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?
- Site located adjacent to A449 Worcester-Malvern Road and a high level of bus route provision (Service No. 44)

#### Yes/No If no stats distance.
- Good access to a range of village services

#### Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?
- Out

#### Summary
- In highway terms the site can only be developed in conjunction with MHPW04 Crown Inn site.

---

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>MHPW04 - Land adj. Crown Inn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s)</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood Zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Site fronts A449 and no direct access will be permitted. In highway terms site can only be developed in conjunction with Site MHPW04 Crown Inn site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas in vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Site adjacent to public house and residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No TPO's within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>1:200 shallow surface water drainage issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No observations made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Site located adjacent to A449 Worcester-Malvern Road and a high level of bus route provision (Service No. 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>In highway terms the site can only be developed in conjunction with MHPW04 Crown Inn site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>MHPW09 Former allotments, Winsmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has no frontage to a public highway. To the west of the site it has a frontage to a track over which a public right of way runs. This track is in terms of its width and alignment unsuitable to serve the developments site, its junction with the A449 to the north west of the development site is also substandard. There is no suitable means of safely accessing this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No designated areas in vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Site adjacent to residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPO’s within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Information to be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>No surface water drainage issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 2 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td>No observations made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Site located adjacent to A449 Worcester-Malvern Road and a high level of bus route provision.(Service No: 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Part of eastern portion of site could be developed subject to careful design and landscaping and to suitable remediation of vehicular access and parking issues along Winsmore.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>MHPW11 Bowling Green farm, Collettis Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>If this site were to be developed then all existing accesses on to the A449 must be permanently closed. It is identified that this site may be developed in conjunction with MHPW03 the comments to which would also apply to this site. The development site proposals show an access to Sparrowhall Lane, observations on site have indicated that the developers ability to be able to provide a suitable access may not be possible due to third party land requirements to meet visibility standards. Sparrowhall Lane joins the A449 to the south of the site, this junction is at the end of a short section of dual carriageway and any development may lead to an increase in right turn manoeuvres which will need to be mitigated against should the development of this site be promoted. It is our opinion that this site should not to be supported. If the site were to be promoted separate from MHPW03 and restricted to perhaps conversion of existing farm buildings which were accessed off the end of Bowling Green Road and delivered the closure of the existing access support for such a scheme may be given without the requirement to improve Sparrowhall Lane junction. Any development of this site which proposes direct access to the A449 will be strongly resisted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No designated areas in vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Road noise could be a problem from A449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site well screened by existing hedgerow but no guarantee this can be maintained following development. Site development on its own would have little impact as previously developed land but cumulative impact is more significant with MHPW03 &amp; 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPO’s within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>1:200 shallow surface water drainage issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No observations received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Site located adjacent to A449 Worcester-Malvern Road and a high level of bus route provision. (Service No: 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Redevelopment of site could take place outside the remit of the housing allocations subject to suitable access requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1:200 shallow surface water drainage issue
**MAJOR CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The development site proposal will be accesses off Sparrowhall Lane; observations on site have indicated that the developers ability to be able to provide a suitable access may not be possible due to third party land requirements to meet accessibility standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>Site not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Site adjacent to residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Views of site currently screened by row of conifers along the boundary, however no guarantee screen can be retained. Cumulative impact will be more significant with MHPW03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td>No TPO's within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Site fairly well screened by mature hedgerows. If being considered as part of larger site, should consider the cumulative impact of the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>No surface water drainage issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Grade 3 on ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>No observations received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
<td>Site located adjacent to A449 Worcester-Malvern Road and a high level of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contaminated land.</td>
<td>bus route provision. (Service No: 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Good access to a range of village services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site included within or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Site is only viable if linked with MHPW03 and there are remaining vehicular access issues to resolve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Site is only viable if linked with MHPW03 and there are remaining vehicular access issues to resolve.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site not within defined Flood Zone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site not within specified distance for either facility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The site fronts the A449, any direct access to serve either the site or individual accesses from the A449 will be resisted. The developer has however made it known that he has the ability to provide an access from Russell Close. In principle the design submitted for gaining access via Russell Close is acceptable. The potential impact of the development on the traffic signals at the junction of Hospital Lane and A449 will have to be assessed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No designated areas in vicinity of the site.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site adjacent to residential development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Semi-rural site, impression is of having left the village, partly due to any properties beyond this point being hidden by rural hedging.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td><strong>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No TPO's within or adjacent to the site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Development of the site would mean the potential loss of the scrubby hedge that runs north-south and forms a historic boundary feature. The hedgerow bounding the road marks a distinctive feature since the OS maps were produced hence raising its importance in the landscape.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td><strong>1:200 shallow surface water drainage issue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grade 3 on ALC map</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No observations received</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site located adjacent to A449 Worcester-Malvern Road and a high level of bus route provision. (Service No: 44)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Good access to a range of village services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>The gap between The Crown Inn and the next property allow the first distant views of the Malvern Hills when leaving Collets Green heading west. Development of the site will mean loss of this view. Access appears acceptable in principle from Russell Close but the potential impact of the development on the traffic signals at the junction of Hospital Lane and A449 will have to be assessed</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Major Criteria**

- **SHLAA site reference**: MHPW15 Land to east of Hospital Lane, Colletts Green (part of MHPW02)
- **Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA)**: Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period
- **Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone**: Site not within defined Flood Zone
- **Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**: Site not within specified distance for either facility
- **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.** Subject to junction design complying with current standards the development of this site off Hospital Lane would be principle be acceptable.
- **Subject to junction design complying with current standards the development of this site off Hospital Lane would be principle be acceptable.** The potential impact of the development on the traffic signals at the junction of Hospital Lane and A449 will have to be assessed.
- **Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**: No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water
- **Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.** No designated areas in vicinity of the site.
- **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**: No
- **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.**: Site adjacent to residential development
- **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**: Very rural, open feel to site secured by mature hedgerows.
- **There is no significant net loss of protected open space?**: Site is adjacent to OPEN 2 - football club
- **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**: Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area
- **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?**: There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.** The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.** The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features
- **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.** No TPO's within or adjacent to the site
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.** The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17
- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.** There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site
- **There is no adverse impact on ancient hedgerow.** Traditional hedgerows a feature of this site
- **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).** 1:30 deep major surface water drainage issues
- **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.** Grade 3 on ALC map
- **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.** Known land fill site with contamination issues. No observations received
- **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?** Site located adjacent to A449 Worcester-Malvern Road and a high level of bus route provision. (Service No: 44)
- **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?** Good access to a range of village services
- **Summary**


**Summary**

The site has a very open and rural feel to the area despite the proximity of the former hospital site development due in part to the traditional field hedges, still very much in evidence, and the fact that there is no development present on the eastern side of the road. Development of this site would represent unacceptable outward encroachment into open countryside. The potential impact of the development on the traffic signals at the junction of Hospital Lane and A449 would have to be assessed.
### Rushwick

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>MHRW01 - Land adj to Upperwick Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood Zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The site has an existing field access off C2298 Upper Wick Lane which is opposite the junction of the C2298 and Christine Avenue, this is not acceptable to be developed as an access to serve the development site and access should be taken from Bedwardine Close. Bedwardine Close is not an adopted highway but is the subject of legal agreements for adoption as public highway. The site fronts the A4440 Grove Way to which no access will be permitted. If the whole of this site were to be developed its traffic impact on the junction between C2298/A4440 Grove Way will have to be assessed and mitigated against. Individual direct accesses to properties served off C2298 Upper Wick Lane could be considered in this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features. There is a RIG near the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CNT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a significant gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>Hedge along the frontage of the site is relatively newly established meaning removal/alteration is not really a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td>Flood risk assessment required and drainage strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>None identified by Contaminated Land Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes. 417 service to/from Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes, primary school, public house &amp; post office?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>No parish plan available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

Site would form a natural round off of development adjacent to existing affordable housing scheme. Vehicular access could be taken from Bedwardine Close, not adopted highway but is the subject of legal agreements for adoption as public highway.
### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status/Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>MHRW02 - Land at Claphill Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period. (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from C2226 Claphill Lane to serve this development site would be acceptable. If</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the development were to be restricted to the frontage along Claphill Lane, then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>individual direct accesses to properties would be considered acceptable. A public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>right of way crosses the development site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes - residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of access from C2226 Claphill Lane to serve this development site would be</td>
<td>Site is not within a conservation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable. If the development were to be restricted to the frontage along</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a conservation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claphill Lane, then individual direct accesses to properties would be</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considered acceptable. A public right of way crosses the development site.</td>
<td>Site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes within Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Yes within Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is currently well screened from neighbouring road and footpath to its</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a conservation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east by established hedgerows, although the potential for change should not</td>
<td>Site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be underestimated if development is undertaken.</td>
<td>Site is currently well screened from neighbouring road and footpath to its east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>Flood risk assessment required and drainage strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
<td>None identified by Contaminated Land Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contaminated land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if</td>
<td>Yes 417 service to/from Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from</td>
<td>Yes, primary school, public house &amp; post office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than</td>
<td>No parish plan available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

Paddock well related to edge of settlement and with housing development on southern and northern boundaries. Highways would accept single point of access from Claphill Lane. Site needs careful layout and design to safeguard roadside hedgerows/ trees and provide safe footpath access into the village.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th><strong>MHRW-05 Land west of Western Bypass</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from C2226 Claphill Lane to serve this development site would be acceptable, this would however restrict development potential to less than 100 units. To extend the development beyond 100 units a secondary access would be required and whilst the site fronts both the A4440 Grove Way and A4103 Hereford Road, no access to either of these roads will be permitted. If the whole of this site were to be developed it’s traffic impact on junctions between C2226/A44, C2226/C2298, C2298/A4103 and C2298/A4440 Grove Way will have to be assessed and mitigated against. Individual direct accesses to properties served off C2226 Claphill Lane would be considered. There are two public rights of way crossing the site.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Site adj western Bypass - traffic noise attenuation scheme maybe required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>There are a number of footpaths crossing site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CP13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlif/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPUs.</strong></td>
<td>No TPUs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>Yes within Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>No comments provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>None identified by Contaminated Land Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes 417 service to/from Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes, primary school, public house &amp; post office?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No parish plan available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Ruled out due to scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to both the A4103 Hereford Road and C2298 Bransford Road. Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from C2298 Bransford Road to serve this development site would be acceptable. Direct access either to serve the development site or individual accesses to the A4103 Hereford Road will be resisted on grounds of highway safety. Individual accesses to properties served off C2298 Bransford Road would be considered. A public right of way crosses the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Site adj Grove Way Bypass - traffic noise attenuation scheme maybe required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>A public right of way crosses the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No comments provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>None identified by Contaminated Land Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes 417 service to/from Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes, village hall &amp; post office?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Ruled out due to location
MHRW07 - Land off former Bransford Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Criteria</th>
<th>Other Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from Old Bransford Road to serve this development site would be acceptable. If the development were to be restricted to the frontage along Old Bransford Road, then individual direct accesses to properties would be considered acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Site adj Grove Way Bypass - traffic noise attenuation scheme maybe required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Flood risk assessment required and drainage strategy required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>None identified by Contaminated Land Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes 417 service to/from Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, village hall &amp; post office but only via underpass to Bypass; access to St Johns but some considerable distance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Site would consolidate development on this part of Bransford Road next to Bypass and is closely associated with Worcester but linked to Rushwick with adjacent underpass. Needs acceptable access off Old Bransford Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Site would consolidate development on this part of Bransford Road next to Bypass and is closely associated with Worcester but linked to Rushwick with adjacent underpass. Needs acceptable access off Old Bransford Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>MHRW08 - Land off new Bransford Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone</td>
<td>Site is partially within flood zone 2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4485 Bransford Road to serve this development site would be acceptable, this would however restrict development potential to less than 100 units. Due to the strategic nature of Bransford Road being an arterial route into the City individual direct accesses to properties would be resisted. A public right of way crosses the development site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Site adj Grove Way Bypass - traffic noise attenuation scheme maybe required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no net loss of protected open space due to rural development.</td>
<td>No comments provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Flood risk issues need investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 2 (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>None identified by Contaminated Land Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes 417 service to/from Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Limited by underpass to Bypass, access to St Johns but some considerable distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWOP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Ruled out as significant part of site in flood zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHRW10 - Land to west of Village Hall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has a frontage to both the C2298 Bransford Road and an unclassified highway. Subject to junction design complying with design standards, a single point of access from C2298 Bransford Road to serve this development site would be acceptable. Access to the unclassified road will be resisted on grounds of highway safety due to its alignment, narrow width and substandard junction with the C2298 Bransford Road. Individual accesses to properties served off C2298 Bransford Road would be considered as would an infill plot fronting the unclassified road. A public right of way crosses the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - agricultural/Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>A public right of way crosses the development site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy C213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy C217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No comments provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No surface water issue identified but further investigation needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>None identified by Contaminated Land Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes 417 service to/from Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, primary school, village hall, public house &amp; post office?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Ruled out due to scale and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression</td>
<td>The site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has an existing field access off C2298 Upper Wick Lane which is</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close to the junction of the C2298 and A4440 Grove Way, this is not</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable to be developed as an access to serve the development site.</td>
<td>of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a public right of way crossing the site.</td>
<td>No comments provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No surface water issue identified but further investigation needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/ surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site adj Grove Way bypass - traffic noise attenuation scheme maybe required.</td>
<td>land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A public right of way crosses the development site.</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td>No comments provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No surface water issue identified but further investigation needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td>land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/ landscape site.</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms</td>
<td>No comments provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of LP Policy DS17</td>
<td>No surface water issue identified but further investigation needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and so if there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with</td>
<td>land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site. Yes/No if</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no stats distance.</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes:417 service to/from Worcester</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWOP Out</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHRW11 - Land to west of Coronation Avenue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>access from C2298 Bransford Road to serve this development site would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>be acceptable. The site also abuts the end of Coronation Avenue which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>highway records indicate runs all the way to the site boundary, therefore to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>extend this road into the site would be acceptable. If the development were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>to be restricted to the frontage along C2298 Bransford Road, then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>individual direct accesses to properties would be considered acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>No designated areas within vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>of LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No comments provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No surface water issue identified but further investigation needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Yes 417 service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Yes, primary school, village hall public house &amp; post office?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>No parish plan available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruled out due to scale and location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can</td>
<td>Availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression</td>
<td>Development of this site will be resisted on highway safety grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specified features</td>
<td>Yes/no, please state type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes - residential/agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td>specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>LP Policy DS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>No surface water issues detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from</td>
<td>Summary, Availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes to public house/millennium green recreation area. Shop/P3 now closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>MRHT02 - Land between B4196 &amp; Wych Elm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period. ( e. g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Site not within defined Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site not within specified distance for either facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from B4204 to serve this development site would be acceptable. Continuous footway between the entrance to ‘Holt Millennium Ground’ and the A443/A4133/B4196 junction will also be required. Frontage accesses onto the B4196 will be resisted on highway safety grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes - residential/agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>Site is adj to Millennium Green - check whether local wildlife/ecological interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy OS17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>There is no Ancient woodland in the vicinity of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>Adjacent to Millennium Green - mature hedgerows which could be significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td>South east &amp; south west boundary to Road has issues ranging from 1 in 30 deep to 1 in 200 shallow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes - if upper part of site is included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes to public house/millennium green recreation area. Shop/PO now closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Development of the site would extend the village to the north west into open countryside and would be prominently viewed from B4296.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>MHRP02 - Land east of Green Gables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAJOR CRITERIA**

- **Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).**
  - Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period
- **Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.**
  - Not within defined zones
- **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**
  - Yes
- **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity, Yes/no, please state type.**
  - Adjacent to residential uses
- **If the site is in Green Belt Yes/No?**
  - No
- **Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**
  - No known sites
- **Is the site in Flood Zone 3a or 3b?**
  - No comments received
- **Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**
  - Yes
- **Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**
  - No known sites
- **Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**
  - No known sites
- **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?**
  - No
- **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.**
  - Adjacent to residential uses
- **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**
  - Site does not contain any protected open space
- **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**
  - Site not within or adjacent to CA
- **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?**
  - Site not adjacent to or in vicinity of LB
- **There is no detrimental impact on Scheduled Ancient Monument.**
  - Site not adjacent to or in vicinity of SAM
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**
  - No sites adjoining or in vicinity
- **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**
  - No TPOs within or adjoining site
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**
  - Site not within Significant Gap
- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**
  - No Ancient woodland identified
- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.**
  - No Ancient Hedgerows
- **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).**
  - No incidence of flooding recorded on the site
- **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**
  - Grade 3
- **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.**
  - Within 200m of Ripple landfill
- **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.**
  - No bus services within specified distance?
- **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**
  - Site close to village centre and facilities
- **Site ruled in or out of SWDP**
  - Out

**OTHER CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Site adjacent to builders yard and sewage treatment works. Development of site would be out of scale and character with the pattern of development in the village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No known sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Adjacent to residential uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site does not contain any protected open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site not adjacent to or in vicinity of CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)</td>
<td>Site not adjacent to or in vicinity of LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No sites adjoining or in vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjoining site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Site not within significant Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No Ancient woodland identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No Ancient Hedgerows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No incidence of flooding recorded on the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Within 200m of Ripple landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>No bus services within specified distance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Site reasonably close to village centre and facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of the site would extend the village in a northerly direction into open countryside that would detract from the rural character of the settlement</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>MHRP03 - Land off School Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Not within defined zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No known sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Adjacent to residential uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site does not contain any protected open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site not within or adjacent to CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Site not adjacent to or in vicinity of LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No sites adjoining or in vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs within or adjoining site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Site not within significant Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No Ancient woodland identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No Ancient Hedgerows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No incidence of flooding recorded on the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Within 200m of Ripple landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>No bus services within specified distance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Site reasonably close to village centre and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Summary | Development of the site would extend the village in a northerly direction into open countryside that would detract from the rural character of the settlement |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State flood zone.</td>
<td>Not within a flood zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>There is no hazardous pipeline or gas compression station in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access from Bell Lane to serve this development site would be acceptable. Individual accesses to properties from the B4196 will be resisted in the interests of highway safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Open Countryside and limited residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site is not immediately adjacent, however is within 200m of Shrawley Wood, which is a designated SWS and an ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No, however there are several significant trees on the eastern boundary of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>There is an Ancient Woodland within 200m of the site (north of the site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 2 and non agricultural. Part of land has recently been approved change of use from agricultural use to garden land (09/00133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Site is not considered to be contaminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>very limited services available. Within 400m of a the New Inn pub and post box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Despite the fact that part of land has been granted change of use to garden curtilage and lies adjacent to settlement boundary, development of the site would extent the village in a linear form and detract from the rural character of the village.

---

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shrawley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHSH03/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State flood zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Sites are in numerical order as set out in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Where a number appears to be missing it will be captured in Appendix 3 where there is a list of sites that have been ruled out before going through this process with the reason for doing so.

In order for sites to be considered against the criteria they have to be within or immediately adjacent to categories 1, 2 or 3 villages or within the development boundaries in Droitwich Spa, Evesham and Pershore.

There is a separate table at the end of the assessments containing the number of homes in each parish in 2001 (Census 2001) and those built for the period of 1 April 2001 to 31 March 2010 demonstrating the percentage growth experienced by parish. The level of growth experienced by each parish and the existing number of homes has been considered within the criteria and when allocating sites.
Willow Court (SHLAA 32-02)

Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).

Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate?

Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?

There is not significant net loss of protected open space?

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.

There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.

There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.

There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.

There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.

The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?

Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?

Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.

The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.

Site ruled in or out of SWDP

Summary

This site is allocated in the Wychavon Local Plan. Put forward at Preferred Options for 25 dwellings. Following further objection from EA to the review of the SFRA only the garage court area of site allocated for 10 dwellings in the draft SWDP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Major Criteria</strong></th>
<th><strong>Other Criteria</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>Acre Lane (SHLAA 32-09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes - Council owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Difficult access over traffic controlled railway bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Some residential property nearby. Very close to railway line. Some commercial properties adjacent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Check with Contaminated Land Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. 94m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes 400m to Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Allocated for 20 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible access issues over railway bridge for 20 vehicles. Loss of community facilities - Guide and Scout Huts but opportunity to relocate elsewhere. Allocated for 20 dwellings in SWDP.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>Boxing Club (SHLAA 32-11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes - Council owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1. Not in floodplain but adjacent to canal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes - Highways feedback sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Close to railway, industrial premises nearby (designated at employment land to south). Ancient Monument opposite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Awaiting comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Adjacent to Canal Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monument on opposite side of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Identified as &quot;more risk&quot; in SFRA - check with Drainage Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Check with Contaminated land officer due to proximity to industrial use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. 170m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Town Centre with 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Allocated for 10 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Could assist in meeting action points in the Town Plan. Potential for canal side enhancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Not a typical residential area but no distinct character in the general vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>32-12 Canal Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>3a/3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt? Yes/No?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Site surrounded by town centre mixed uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt? Yes/No?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Site surrounded by town centre mixed uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt? Yes/No?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Site surrounded by town centre mixed uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt? Yes/No?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Site surrounded by town centre mixed uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not give rise to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Area of more risk. Can be mitigated by water management approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. PDL likely to be contaminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering/supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Yes. Supported by adopted Town Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>A centrally located brownfield site. Identified for mixed use in the Droitwich Canal SPG and allocated in Wychavon Local Plan. Put forward at Preferred Options and allocated in the draft SWDP for a mixed use housing scheme to include 80 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>32-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes, Via Vines Lane/Kidderminster Road to A38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Severn Trent have no principle objection to the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is not within 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity, Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Although within close proximity to Kidderminster Road employment site separated by railway line. Proximity to railway/A38 by-pass may raise some noise/pollution issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No, CA boundary adjacent but on other side of railway line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Yes, Close proximity to site of Roman villa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer):</td>
<td>Yes PDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Two bus stop within 350m &amp; 500m respectively. 800m to town centre and train station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, 800m to town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>65 @ 30dph. Given central location 70dph may be achievable = 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Developer contributions &amp; opening up of Roman site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrally located brownfield site promoted by Droitwich Civic Society through 2008 SWJCS Preferred Options. Could be developed for residential (or mixed use) reinforcing access to town centre although this would require infrastructure to link across river/canal. Could help enhance links from Bays Meadow to town. Loss of employment site and potential negative impact on SAM. Put forward to the Preferred Options, allocated for 100 dwellings in the SWDP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>32-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes. Current Local Plan allocation with planning history for several applications that have been refused/withdrawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Part within the floodplain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Within Canal Conservation Area. Redevelopment could enhance the setting of the Canal Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Phase 1 ground contamination assessment required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. 200m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Town centre. 300-400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Allocated in the Local Plan for 70 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No other than usual developer contributions. Some canalside enhancement opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Allocated in the Local Plan. Deliverable site suggest put forward for reallocation in SWDP. Flooding issue can be mitigated through design. Currently being built out for residential and residential care.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>32-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes. Developer option on the site. Designated an ADR in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes to Tagwell Road. May be wider highway impact on Pulley Lane and junction with A38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Water Cycle Study shows limited capacity at Ladywood treatment plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Phase 1 ground level contamination study required as pond onsite that may have been back-filled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. 100-200m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No. 1km to Tesco Metro at Mulberry Tree Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>102 @ 30dph. Could possibly go to 150 at a higher density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No other than usual developer contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No. Surrounding locality already residential in character.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Although identified in the Local Plan as an ADR site it is the officer view that this site should not be identified for a SAP allocation given proximity and impact from the M5, and that it is disconnected from the town centre. Rule out in the SHLAA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No. Landowners position unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes. Via George Baylis Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No. Surrounded by industrial, may be more suitable for mixed use residential/employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Phase 1 ground contamination assessment required because of the sites existing use for employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Bus stop 250m. Rail station 600m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?.</td>
<td>Town centre 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>55 @ 30dph. Given central location 70dph may be achievable = 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No other than usual developer contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Centrally located brownfield site. Could be developed for residential (or mixed use) reinforcing access to town centre although loss of employment site a consideration. Bad neighbour issues with surrounding industrial/employment uses and proximity to A38/railway line.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowners have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes. Previous applications for resi/mixed use. Site cleared in anticipation of redevelopment other than employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood Zone.</td>
<td>Yes. Although in the flood zone promoters believe that flood alleviation can be delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes. To Salwarpe Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Water Cycle Study shows limited capacity at Ladywood treatment plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Residential development to the west. Proximity to railway line could raise issue of noise pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Flooding matters would need to be addressed to the satisfaction of Council’s engineers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Phase 1 ground contamination assessment required because of the sites existing use for employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Bus within 350m, railway station 500m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Town centre 800m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>60 @ 30 dph. Given central location 70dph may be achievable = 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No other than usual developer contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Put forward atPreferred Options for allocation 100 dwellings. Further objection by EA to review of the SFRA relating to significant flooding issues. Not allocated in the SWDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>32-43 Land between Mayflower Road &amp; Cockshute Hill (Scout Hut) Droitwich Sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Yes. Would support the relocation of dated Scout HQ building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This is a brownfield site and would be suitable for development. Issue of location adjacent to M5 so air and noise pollution could be an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Criteria</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Part of the site protected by ENV5 (Regional or Local wildlife importance) &amp; CA. Mature trees to work around. 1km to Town centre. Allocated in SWDP for 6 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:**

- **SHLAA site reference:** 32-44 Oakham Place
- **32-44 Oakham Place**
- **Yes - Council owned**
- **Flood Zone 1.**
- **No**
- **Yes - Continued from Oakham Place**
- **Yes**
- **No - but site of Regional or Local Wildlife importance**
- **No**
- **Yes, Residential**
- **Awaiting comments**
- **No**
- **Edge of site within Conservation Area**
- **No**
- **No**
- **Edge of site within Regional or local site of Wildlife Importance. Mature established trees bounding Ombersley Way.**
- **No**
- **No**
- **No**
- **No**
- **Part of the site within less risk area.**
- **No**
- **Unlikely - Check with Contaminated Land Officer**
- **Yes, 250m**
- **Reasonable access within about 1km to Town Centre and School.**
- **Allocated for 6 units**
- **No**
- **No**
- **Part of the site protected by ENV5 (Regional or Local wildlife importance) & CA. Mature trees to work around. 1km to Town centre. Allocated in SWDP for 6 dwellings.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>32-45 Land off Steynors Avenue Droitwich Spa Stalls Farm Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes - Council owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes - Onto Steynors Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential. Adjacent to railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Awaiting comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Yes - Part of a wider area of POS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Lower part of the site within intermediate risk area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Unlikely - Check with Contaminated lane Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. Local shop 350m. 700m to school. 1km to Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Allocated for 40 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Yes. Loss of valuable open grassland/recreation space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Lower part of the site has intermediate surface water flooding risk. Reasonable access to services. Loss of open recreational space (see COM13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Evesham**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>37-N14 - Former Evesham Leisure Centre, Davies Road - ruled in for SHLAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Direct access to Davies Road subject to visibility improvements crossing the adjacent college site have been agreed with the landowners. As part of the development proposals public transport improvements have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Trading centre to east. Residential to north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>GI comment - no comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Not an issue in accordance with the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Low - Phase I with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>site area = 1.21 giving approx 36 units @30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

Preferred site - keep ruled in 36 units
**MAJOR CRITERIA**

- **SHLAA site reference**: 37-U34 - Garages between Cheltenham Road and Fountain Court - ruled in as SHLAA site

- **Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA)**: Available in 5 years

- **Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone**: Flood zone 1

- **Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**: Yes

- **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**: Previous discussions on this site identified that no access could be achieved from Cheltenham Road and the landowner was going to investigate the possibility of accessing the site from Waterside. This was over 4 years ago and no further representation has been received, therefore it must be observed that this site cannot be accessed and is consequently cannot be developable.

- **Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**: In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.

- **Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**: No

- **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**: No

- **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/No, please state type.**: Yes - residential nearby

- **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**: Yes - SWS within 100 m - Part of green corridor, provides connectivity, check for habitat interest; pangolins etc.

- **There is no significant net loss of protected open space?**: No

- **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**: No

- **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).**: No

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**: No

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**: No

- **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**: No

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**: No

- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**: No

- **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).**: It appears that part of the site falls within a Highways flooding area in accordance with the SFRA

- **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**: No

- **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)**: Medium - Phase I and II with application

- **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.**: Yes

- **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**: Yes

- **Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?**: site area = 0.28 giving approx 6 units @30 dph

- **Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.**: No

- **The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.**: No

- **Site ruled in or out of SWDP**: Out

**OTHER CRITERIA**

- **Summary**: Not a Preferred site for SWDP as concerned about access - rule out
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes/No/No comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Single ownership / Available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>With the improvements secured as part of the adjacent development site to Peewit Road and B4085 access to this potential development site could be acceptable. Note - The Abbey Bridge / Waterside / Cheltenham Road signalised junction experiences congestion due to shortfalls in capacity, therefore any developments which impact on these signals will have to be mitigated against increase in flows. This directly relates to sites in Hampton and along Cheltenham Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - Residential to north and east. Open farmland to south and west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>GI comment - no comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td>Not an issue in accordance with the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</strong></td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>site area = 2.09 giving approx 105 units @30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes/No/No comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Preferred site - Hampton Strategic Allocation (south) - keep ruled in for 63 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>37-024 - Land at Merrybrook, Hampton - ruled in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Available in 5 years/single ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zones 3 and 1 (10% of site within flood plain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access can only be taken from Pershore Road, B4084, dependant upon the level of development a dedicated right turn designed in accordance with DMRB will be expected as the minimum requirement to access the site. If opposite sites 37-N09 and 37-A01 were to be developed in conjunction with this site then a roundabout to serve both site would be appropriate. Street Lighting improvements along the B4085 will be required. No individual accesses will be permitted from the B4084. Note - The Abbey Bridge / Waterside / Cheltenham Road signalised junction experiences congestion due to shortfalls in capacity, therefore any developments which impact on these signals will have to be mitigate against increase in flows. This directly relates to sites in Hampton and along Cheltenham Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes. This site somewhat detached from the settlement but residential uses are found further to the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes - SWS within 100m and BAP site within 25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>The very western fringes of the site could be affected by areas of 'intermediate' and 'less' risk in accordance with the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Low - Phase I with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if not stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>site area =17.1 giving approx 513 units at 30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Yes - the site is detached from the settlement at present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Preferred site - rule in (in part) - Eastern edge is required for Hampton Strategic Allocation (This site is to the West of the strategic allocation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>37-A03 - Land off Pershore Road, Hampton - ruled out in SHLAA - Availability Unknown - now ruled in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Unknown - now ruled in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Available in 5 years/single ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Note - The Abbey Bridge / Waterside / Cheltenham Road signalised junction experiences congestion due to shortfalls in capacity, therefore any developments which impact on these signals will have to be mitigate against increase in flows. This directly relates to sites in Hampton and along Cheltenham Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Yes adjacent residential to the north and east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes - SWS within 100m and BAP site within 25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Not an issue in accordance with the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes 320m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, 270m to shop, 750m to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>site area = 3.44 giving approx 103 units @30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Will contribute towards additional POS, country park, new farm shop etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Infrastructure contributions would be required if this site is carried forward, due to existing congestion problems on Cheltenham road / Waterside / Abbey Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Preferred site - Hampton Strategic allocation (north) - keep ruled in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available in 5 years/single ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Note - The Abbey Bridge / Waterside / Cheltenham Road signalised junction experiences congestion due to shortfalls in capacity, therefore any developments which impact on these signals will have to be mitigate against increase in flows. This directly relates to sites in Hampton and along Cheltenham Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes adjacent residential to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>The south westerly corner of the site could be affected by an area of ‘intermediate’ and ‘less’ risk in accordance with the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Site area = 3.99 giving approx 200 units @30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Will contribute towards additional POS, country park, new farm shop etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Infrastructure contributions would be required if this site is carried forward, due to existing congestion problems on Cheltenham road / Waterside / Abbey Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Preferred site - Hampton Strategic Allocation (Centre) - keep ruled in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37-A11 - Bewdley Court (incl carpark) - ruled out - Availability Unknown - consider should be ruled back in if availability can be determined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>くれる</th>
<th>37-A11 - Bewdley Court (incl carpark) - ruled out - Availability Unknown - consider should be ruled back in if availability can be determined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Availability unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Comment not required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential to the south</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>The road frontage and south easterly corner of the site could be affected by an area of ‘less’ risk in accordance with the SFRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>site area = 0.61 giving approx 43 units @30 dph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Not a Preferred site in SWDP as concerned about loss of parking and ownership - keep ruled out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available in 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential to the south</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes - BAP within 25 m - Road and railway ecological corridors need buffering; strong southern boundary hedge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>The site itself appears to suffer no risk of surface water flooding but may need further investigation to look at site edges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).</td>
<td>Low - Phase I with application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>No 632 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Over 800m to shops and schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>site area = 1.9 giving approx 57 units @30 dph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Not a Preferred site as strong landscape concerns -keep ruled out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.

Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?

There is not significant net loss of protected open space?

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.

There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.

There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.

There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.

There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.

The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).

It appears that part of the site falls within a ‘historic surface water flooding area’ in accordance with the SFRA

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?

Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?

site area = 2.16 giving approx 151 units @30 dph (this will probably be a significantly smaller number once POS has been taken into account)

Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.

The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.

Site ruled in or out of SWDP

Out

Summary

Not a Preferred site as concerned about access and PPG17 - keep ruled out
Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA). Available now

Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone. Part of site subject to flood risk - this area only suitable for POS

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? Yes

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. Comment not required

Sewerage and Water supply adequate? In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.

Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. No

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No? No

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. Yes - residential to the east

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? No comments received

There is no significant net loss of protected open space? No

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? No

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s). No

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. No

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. No

There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. No

There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. No

There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. No

There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow. Not an issue in accordance with the SFRA

The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer). Not an issue in accordance with the SFRA

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. No

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer) No comments received

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance. No

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? Yes

Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? site area = 3.1 giving approx 217 units @30 dph (this will probably be a significantly smaller number once flooding has been taken into account)

Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan. No

The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement. No

Site ruled in or out of SWDP Out

Summary Not a Preferred site - initially ruled out of the SHLAA for flood reasons - the site now has planning permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access to this site should be restricted to Avon Street only, access directly to High Street will be resisted. The level of development identified must be viewed as a maximum as the surrounding highway network has restricted access and any development which significantly increases traffic generation will be detrimental to the highway network. Pedestrian connectivity between the site and the Town Centre is restricted by the footway widths along Avon Street therefore improvements should be sort as part of the development of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Not an issue in accordance with the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>site area = 0.48 giving approx 34 units @30 dph (However, consider this should be a mixed use site so 22 units would be a more appropriate number on this site - two-thirds residential, one third business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering/supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U18 - Central market and Post Office - ruled out - Duplication / Availability Unknown - however, economic development would support a mixed use 2/3rds residential (particularly if for the elderly here) therefore possibly rule back in?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary
Not a Preferred site - following discussions it is considered that alternative uses are deemed more appropriate for this site

No comments received
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shlaa site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>37-U27 - Employment site - top of Kings Road - ruled out - Availability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Unknown - consider we should rule back in if ownership can be determined -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g through Shlaa).</td>
<td>could link in to strategic site and Economic Development happy to see this as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>wholly residential due to poor access for existing employment site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access to the strategic allocated site at Offenham Road has been agreed via</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a new roundabout on Offenham Road with pedestrian / cycling and public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transport links on to Kings Road. Any development proposal which increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traffic in and along Kings Road or the surrounding road network would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resisted. Therefore the development potential of this site for residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should be pursued in conjunction with the adjacent Offenham Road preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>option site. The removal of the current industrial use being accessed through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>residential areas would be welcomed especially now that access to the new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bengeworth School is in close proximity to the site entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt ? Yes/ No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity,</td>
<td>Residential to the south but separated by long access drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm</td>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td>Not an issue in accordance with the SFRA, however marina lies to the west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>so this will need consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community</td>
<td>Site area = 1.51 giving approx 76 units @30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should</td>
<td>infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Preferred site - will form part of the larger Offenham Road strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>allocation rule in (see37-A18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>37-012 - Land off Eastwick Drive - ruled out - Availability Unknown - However, consider this should be ruled back in if availability can be determined as Economic Development would support a mixed use site here with 2/3rds residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Need Brian to comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt? Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Not an issue in accordance with the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>site area = 0.56 giving approx 38 units @30 dph (However, consider this should be a mixed use site so 13 units would be a more appropriate number on this site - two-thirds residential, one third business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Not a Preferred site as availability remains unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>37-U20 - Telephone Exchange, Abbey Road - ruled out - Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown - However, consider this site should be ruled back in for employment if ownership / availability can be determined - this would form an important gateway site into the town centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Need Brian to comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Not an issue in accordance with the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Site area 0.63 - consider this site would be more appropriate for employment if availability issues could be resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Not a Preferred site as concerned about availability - keep ruled out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SHLAA site reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>37-U26 - Warehouse off Badsey Road - ruled out - Availability Unknown -</strong></td>
<td><strong>However, consider site should be ruled back in if ownership can be determined</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Need Brian to comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Not an issue in accordance with the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>site area = 0.2 giving approx 14 units @30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Not a Preferred site as concerned about availability - keep ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Criteria</td>
<td>37-A01 - Land to the north of Pershore Road, Hampton - now ruled in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>Available in 5 years</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Available in 5 years</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td><strong>Flood zone 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td><strong>This land has no highway frontage and can only be developed in conjunction with site 37-N09. Note - The Abbey Bridge / Waterside / Cheltenham Road signalised junction experiences congestion due to shortfalls in capacity, therefore any developments which impact on these signals will have to be mitigate against increase in flows. This directly relates to sites in Hampton and along Cheltenham Road.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes - Residential land to east</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes - SWS within 100m and BAP site within 25m -</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not an issue in accordance with the SFRA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</strong></td>
<td><strong>No comments received</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site area 3.115 giving approx 93 units @30 dph</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not a Preferred site as concerned about location, access and more preferable sites (see 37-N09)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Land at Greengables Business Park - ruled in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA). Available in 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone. Need to take</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into account the highest known flood level reached on July 2007.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relocation of Bengeworth School (Phase 1) to the end of Kings Road and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficulties encountered in implementing the junction improvement works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between Kings Road and Drakes Lea has resulted in a road safety concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being raised in close proximity to the School. In order for this site to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed these issues must be resolved. A possible solution would be to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access the site via the adjacent residential development rather than Kings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads. Kings Road is the subject of extensive traffic calming and extensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car parking occurs along either side of the carriageway narrowing the road to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the point whereby its ability to serve further development must be questioned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>Yes - Residential land to east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity,</td>
<td>Yes - SWS within 100m and BAP site within 25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If</td>
<td>High - Phase I and II with application and ideally preapplication discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Yes - adjacent to new school, shops within 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>site area = 10.13 ha giving approx 303.9 units @30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Preferred site - will form part of the larger Offenham Road strategic allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>rule in (see 37-U27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>37-N04 - Land rear of Cheltenham Road - ruled out (PP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Summary Preferred site - forms part of the larger strategic allocation at Cheltenham Road (north) - part of this site now has PP approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Centre of site shows areas of ‘less risk’ and a small area of ‘intermediate risk’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - residential to the north and east</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - SWS within 100m and BAP site within 25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Phase I with application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>37-N07 - Land south of Pershore Road , West of Fairfield Road - ruled in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA)</td>
<td>Available in 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Direct access to Davies Road subject to visibility improvements crossing the adjacent college site have been agreed with the landowners. As part of the development proposals public transport improvements have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential to east and south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes - SW5 within 100m - Footpath corridor also provides ecological link; hydrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Southern part of site shows an area of 'less risk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Medium - Phase I and II with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>site area = 2.9 giving approx 87 units @ 30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Not a Preferred site as concerned about location, strategic gap and other preferable sites - rule out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SHLAA site reference**
37-N08 Former Midlands Electricity Board Depot, Worcester Road - ruled out Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Not a Preferred site as on the edge of Shopping Park - rule out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>37-N09 - Land at Merrybrook Farm, Pershore Road - ruled in</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Available now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Access can only be taken from Pershore Road, B4084, dependant upon the level of development a dedicated right turn deigned in accordance with DMRB will be expected as the minimum requirement to access the site. If opposite site 37-024 were to be developed in conjunction with this site then a roundabout to serve both site would be appropriate. Street Lighting improvements along the B4085 will be required. No individual accesses will be permitted from the B4084. Note - The Abbey Bridge / Waterside / Cheltenham Road signalised junction experiences congestion due to shortfalls in capacity, therefore any developments which impact on these signals will have to be mitigate against increase in flows. This directly relates to sites in Hampton and along Cheltenham Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Yes - SWS within 100m and BAP site within 25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td>No risk shown on SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</strong></td>
<td>Low - Phase I with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>site area = 3.115 giving approx 93 units @ 30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - this site will be slightly detached from settlement if developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Not a Preferred site as concerned about location and other preferable sites - rule out (see 37-A01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>37-N10 - Corner site of Sinclair Court and Bewdley Street - ruled in</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No comment required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>GI comment - no comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Low - Phase I with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>site area = 0.05 giving approx. 1.5 units at 30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER CRITERIA** |

| Site ruled in or out of SWDP | Out |

| Summary | Not a Preferred site as site is too small - rule out |
### SHLAA site reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - BAP site within 25 m - Neglected orchard (Noble chafer (rare orchard beetle)); scrub; strong likelihood of ecological interest; part of large orchard complex; footpath access along southern edge; bridleway to east</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No risk shown on SFRA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not a Preferred site as concerned about location, access and other preferable sites - rule out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**248**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Criteria</th>
<th>37-N16 Land to the West of Abbey Road, South of Boat Lane - Ruled In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Available Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Flood Zone 1 &amp; 3, 10% high risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Boat Lane is in part an adopted highway of single width with no footways and is not considered suitable for accessing this site other than for sustainable transport measures, the remaining lower part of Boat Lane is a public footpath over which vehicular rights exist for accessing the ferry. Boat lane will require to be widened in order to facilitate any sustainable measures and if this is carried out to a suitable standard then some frontage development may be permitted. If the provision of a cycle / footpath bridge to replace the Hampton Ferry is to be fully realised then any development proposals on this site must safeguard a suitable route through to the Town Centre. Vehicular access to this site can only be from Abbey Road, which in itself will probably cause little problem in forming, but will have a significant impact on the Abbey Road / Pershore Road / Cheltenham Road / Waterside signals which needs to be assessed before this development proposal can be supported. The site frontage to Abbey Road is bounded by two existing junctions, Abbey Road and access to the Leisure Centre, the junction spacing between these two junctions will preclude a new access being formed to serve this site, therefore it will be necessary to incorporate one or other of these existing junctions into the new layout. More than 200 units will require two points of access and as Boat Lane is ruled out both of these existing access points will be required. Abbey Lane is an adopted road which runs through the site to link back to the Leisure Centre access road which is also adopted highway from this point back to Abbey Road. The development of this site will require the extinguishment of some public highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes / No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Employment / offices to west, playing fields and floodplain to the south and west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No comments made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued overleaf
### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>37-N16 Land to the West of Abbey Road, South of Boat Lane -Continued.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Yes, the site is an area of protected open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Statutory Protected = YES Sensitivity = Very High.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. | 37–N16 is immediately adjacent to or very close to a Local Wildlife Site. In most cases significant buffering of the site and SUDS to prevent pollution will be extremely important and may alter the area fit for allocation. All of these sites may also have onsite value that must be taken into account in any allocation decision. There are concerns in terms of visual impact particularly in views from the south and west (both near and distant views). Most of the site is on an elevated plateau. The Leisure Centre is quite visible and housing further to the south and west would be possibly more so. It would also affect the openness and enjoyment of Corporation Meadow and the riverside footpaths (and the western end of Boat Lane). There may be scope for some smaller scale development to the eastern part of the site, to the west of Ferry View and the south of Boat Lane – subject to buffer planting to the western boundary of any development. The nursery, and the agricultural land across Abbey Road, create a unique character at the entrance to the town centre – reflecting Evesham’s horticultural/market gardening Heritage – it would be regrettable if this unique landscape character and sense of place was lost.\n
Update: I had a look on site today. I think, given the position we are in regarding the 5 year land supply, that there may be scope to develop further to the west than I initially thought (although not in an ideal world!) – as outlined in my email below. I think development could probably go as far west as the access roads that are approx half way between the main access road (shown with the avenue of trees) and the proposed western edge of development – subject to landscaping of the area to the west to ‘soften’ the built edge. The Bell Tower is visible across this site (although the bottom half already obliterated by the development at Abbey Lane Court) – to give a sense of local identity, the design could be revised to allow at least one vista through towards the tower – maybe across the POS, and orientate the buildings so the view is kept over gardens/frontages |
<p>| There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. | No comments made |
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow. | No comments made |
| The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer). | The area adjacent to the river shows areas of ‘intermediate risk’ and ‘more risk’ and a small section around Abbey Lane as an area of ‘intermediate risk’ and ‘less risk’. Also will need to take into account the highest known flood level reached on July 2007. |
| Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. | Yes |
| Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer). | No comments made |
| Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No | Yes - 800km to bus stop |
| If no stats distance. |  |
| Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? | Y. 650km to shops, just over 800km to school |
| Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? | No - 15.67 ha - 470 units @30 dph |
| Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan. | Will contribute towards additional POS and leisure facilities |
| The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement. | Infrastructure contributions would be required if this site is carried forward, due to existing congestion problems on Cheltenham road / Waterside / Abbey Road. |
| Site ruled in or out of SWDP | In |
| Summary | Preferred site at Significant Changes stage (with 37-N17 200 units) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>37-N17 Land to the North of Boat Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1 and 3 - 40% flooding risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Boat Lane is in part an adopted highway of single width with no footways and is not considered suitable for accessing this site other than for sustainable transport measures, the remaining lower part of Boat Lane is a public footpath over which vehicular rights exist for accessing the ferry. Boat lane will require to be widened in order to facilitate any sustainable measures and if this is carried out to a suitable standard then some frontage development may be permitted. If the provision of a cycle / footpath bridge to replace the Hampton Ferry is to be fully realised then any development proposals on this site must safeguard a suitable route through to the Town Centre. Vehicular access to this site can only be from Abbey Road, which in itself will probably cause little problem in forming, but will have a significant impact on the Abbey Road / Pershore Road / Cheltenham Road / Waterside signals which needs to be assessed before this development proposal can be supported. The site frontage to Abbey Road is bounded by two existing junctions, Abbey Road and access to the Leisure Centre, the junction spacing between these two junctions will preclude a new access being formed to serve this site, therefore it will be necessary to incorporate one or other of these existing junctions into the new layout. More than 200 units will require two points of access and as Boat Lane is ruled out both of these existing access points will be required. Abbey Lane is an adopted road which runs through the site to link back to the Leisure Centre access road which is also adopted highway from this point back to Abbey Road. The development of this site will require the extinguishment of some public highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Residential to west. Public footpath through the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued overleaf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th>37-N17 Land to the North of Boat Lane continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Yes, the site is an area of protected open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Statutory Protected = YES Sensitivity = Very High. Notes: Area covered by existing applications and archaeological assessment/mitigation is underway. Southern site boundary formed by Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>37–N17 is immediately adjacent to or very close to a Local Wildlife Site. In most cases significant buffering of the site and SUDS to prevent pollution will be extremely important and may alter the area fit for allocation. All of these sites may also have onsite value that must be taken into account in any allocation decision. Part of this site was the subject of a recent planning application (W/11/02505). Our Landscape Officer has the following views: there may be scope for some development without having too great a visual impact towards the eastern part of the site – continuing the western boundary of the current application site in a southerly direction. I suggest a line arcing around from here over site 37-N-16 above to the end of Abbey Lane. The western boundary would be very sensitive and an appropriate landscape treatment would be required. I would not support any development further towards the river than this line. There is some existing conifer hedging to the lower part of the site – but I would not suggest using this as a development boundary, as experience has shown that these tall conifer hedges are not acceptable to new house-owners, the hedge ends up being removed and its screening function lost. Update: I had a look on site today. I think, given the position we are in regarding the 5 year land supply, that there may be scope to develop further to the west than I initially thought (although not in an ideal world!) – as outlined in my email below. I think development could probably go as far west as the access roads that are approx half way between the main access road (shown with the avenue of trees) and the proposed western edge of development – subject to landscaping of the area to the west to ‘soften’ the built edge. The Bell Tower is visible across this site (although the bottom half already obliterated by the development at Abbey Lane Court) – to give a sense of local identity, the design could be revised to allow at least one vista through towards the tower – maybe across the POS, and orientate the buildings so the view is kept over gardens/frontages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No comments made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No comments made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>The area adjacent to the river shows areas of ‘intermediate risk’ and ‘more risk’ and a small section around Abbey Lane as an area of ‘intermediate risk’ and ‘less risk’. Also will need to take into account the highest known flood level reached on July 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>No comments made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 716km to bus stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Y. 650km to shops, 800km to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No - 9.57 ha - 287units @30dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Will contribute towards additional POS and leisure facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Infrastructure contributions would be required if this site is carried forward, due to existing congestion problems on Cheltenham road / Waterside / Abbey Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Preferred site at Significant Changes stage (with 37-N16 200 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No comments made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes / No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes / No, please state type.</td>
<td>Surrounded by nursery / offices / employment to west, Police to north. Partly in high risk flood to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Yes, the site is an area of protected open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No comments made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No comments made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).</td>
<td>No comments made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes / No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 280km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, 800km to school, 600km to shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No - 3.2 ha - 96 units @ 30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Due to strong conservation objections and location this site is not considered appropriate for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Not a Preferred site - rule out - location and landscape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHLAA site reference: 37-N18 Land to the east of Abbey Road - Ruled In
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>37N19 Land to the west of the A4184 - ruled out Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Not a Preferred site - keep ruled out - location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>37N20 - Land to the east of A46 - Ruled out of SHLAA Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Not a Preferred site - keep ruled out - location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SHLAA site reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>37N21 - Land east of Offenham Rd - Ruled Out of SHLAA Duplicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site forms part of the larger site 37-N2, see comments below. If however this site were to be allocated separate from the remaining site, then frontage development to Offenham Road may be considered subject to providing turning facilities to each property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - continuation of residential to the south of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Comments from Landscape Officer - the approved Offenham Road development will change the landscape character along Offenham Road and so I have no strong landscape objection to development on this site in respect of impact on Offenham Road. However, any development to the east of Offenham Road would be visible from the A46 Evesham by-pass. I would only support development here if a new buffer planting zone (minimum 15m in width and in one ownership – ie outside domestic gardens) was provided to what would be the new rural edge of Evesham to the eastern boundary and native hedge and tree planting to Offenham Road (similar treatment to the approved scheme opposite). I would not support development of the southern portion of the site due to potential tree loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>The SFRA shows an area to the north of the site deemed as 'intermediate risk' and 'less risk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No - 1.88 ha = 26 @ 30dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Preferred site at Significant Changes stage - 15 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SHLAA site reference:** 37-N22 Land to the South of Offenham Road - Ruled In

<p>| Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA). | Available Now |
| Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone. | Flood Zone 1 |
| Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | Yes |
| The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. | Access to this site could be taken from either Badsey Road B4085 or Offenham Road B4510. In both cases developments have been approved which include new access arrangements that would need to be taken into account when providing access to this development site. There is insufficient road frontage along both roads in order to create a new access point so one or both of these junctions will require major alterations. Any access on to Badsey Road will be close to the junction of A46, therefore the Highways Agency will need to be consulted and may oppose such an access. Any access from Offenham Road will require the Elm Road / Offenham Road junction to be fully assessed and improvements over and above those previously approved undertaken to mitigate against the impact any development will have. Due to land constraints it may not be possible to provide adequate improvements at this junction. No access will be permitted directly to the A46. |
| Sewerage and Water supply adequate? | In principle, Severn Trent have no objections. |
| Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. | No |
| Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? | No |
| The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. | Yes residential to the south. |
| There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | No comments made |
| There is not significant net loss of protected open space? | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s). | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. | U - under archaeological significance in SHLAA |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. | Our Landscape Officer would not support any development further to the east than shown for site 37-N21 due to visual impact from the east and loss of orchards which would unacceptably alter the landscape character of the area. Orchards on site- important gateway into the town. |
| There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. | Comments required |
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow. | Comments required |
| The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer). | Small section of ‘intermediate risk’ and ‘less risk’ to the centre of the site |
| Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. | |
| Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer) | No comments made |
| Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance. | 140 m away |
| Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? | Yes school 640km, shops 770km, employment opportunity 640km |
| Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? | No. 9.4 ha = 232 @ 30dph |
| Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan. | |
| The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement. | |
| Site ruled in or out of SWDP | Out |
| Summary | Not a Preferred site - keep ruled out - landscape |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>370-14 Land off Broadway Road - Ruled Out of SHLAA for PPG17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Not a Preferred site - keep ruled out - landscape - however lost on appeal, now has PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>37-015  Tax Office Burford Road - Ruled Out of SHLAA for Flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available</strong> and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt? Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Not a Preferred site - keep ruled out - flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>37-018 Land off Cheltenham Road - ruled in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1 &amp; 3 - 5% high flood risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Residential to the south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>SFRA does not highlight any at risk areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? site area = 0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Not a Preferred site, however, very small section to NW forms part of larger strategic allocation at Cheltenham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>37-O17 - Land off Cheltenham Road - ruled in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Multiple ownership / Available Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone 2, 1% Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Note - The Abbey Bridge / Waterside / Cheltenham Road signalised junction experiences congestion due to shortfalls in capacity, therefore any developments which impact on these signals will have to be mitigate against increase in flows. This directly relates to sites in Hampton and along Cheltenham Road. Sites 37-U01, 37-N02, 37-N05 and 37-O17 form the remainder of strategic allocated site, Cheltenham Road. Access has been agreed to serve sites 37-U02 and 37-N04 which it is proposed to then link via these site to form a link road back to the A46 roundabout. This is a prerequisite of developing these sites in order to provide and improve public transport links.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, Adjacent residential. Chemtura- pesticide testing within site and therefore appropriate mitigation will need to be taken into consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>BAP, 25m away. Adjacent woodland; proximity of adjacent site(s) to Special Wildlife Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Statutory protected and high sensitivity. Area covered by existing applications and archaeological assessment/mitigation is underway. Southern site boundary formed by Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Cluster of TPOs located to South East of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Strategic Gap to west of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>BAP, 25m away. Adjacent woodland; proximity of adjacent site(s) to SWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>SFRA shows some areas deemed as 'less risk' and two small areas of 'intermediate risk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Medium. Phase I and II with application. Information received through Planning in part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? site area = 25.78 giving approx 773 units at 30 dph</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Preferred site as forms part of the strategic allocation at Cheltenham Road (central)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### SHLAA site reference
**Adj37-No3 - land behind Lichfield Avenue - new site at Significant Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>In principle, Severn Trent have no objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - on the edge of the PO site at Offenham Road with residential to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>Statutory Protected = NO, Sensitivity = Unknown. Adjacent area evaluated, with little or no significant remains encountered. This does not mean however the same applies for this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td>SFRA does not highlight any at risk areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes immediately adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes - 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>site area = 1.2 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering/supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Preferred site as forms part of the Offenham Road strategic allocation (new site to be added to SHLAA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pershore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Criteria</th>
<th>Other Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>71-01 - former health centre, priest lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site was allocated in the Local Plan for 15 units, but has not yet been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>granted planning consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No - flood zone 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Library adjacent (may be relocated) and residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site lies within the Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Adjacent listed building (to south)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>There are 6 TPO's on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>Majority of site ok, but intermediate risk of surface water flooding on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm</td>
<td>eastern boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by</td>
<td>Yes - 300m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Yes - school 280m, shops 100m, doctors surgery 310m, community hall 120m,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employment opportunity 400m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site?</td>
<td>Yes - 300m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - school 280m, shops 100m, doctors surgery 310m, community hall 120m,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>employment opportunity 400m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td>No Town Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should</td>
<td>The site is a currently vacant, brownfield site within the Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>and would benefit from a sympathetic redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The site is a currently vacant, brownfield site within the Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and would benefit from a sympathetic redevelopment. Allocated in the Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan. Deliverable site suggest put forward for reallocation in SWDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>71-02 - garage court St Andrews Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>Allocated in Local Plan 10 units, but has not yet been granted planning consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>No - flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEWERAGE AND WATER SUPPLY ADEQUATE?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes - residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 280m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Yes - school 850m, shops 800m, doctors surgery 520m, community hall 950m, employment opportunity 890m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td>10 units 0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No Town Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td>The site is a brownfield site. Allocated in the Local Plan. Deliverable site suggest put forward for reallocation in SWDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>The site is a brownfield site. Allocated in the Local Plan. Deliverable site suggest put forward for reallocation in SWDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>71-03 - Garage court, Abbots Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Allocated in previous plan for 13 units, but has not yet been granted planning consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No - flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>99% of site has not been affected by surface water flooding, but bottom south west corner has but only low risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - school 550m, shops 650m, doctors surgery 595m, community hall 780m, employment opportunity 760m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>13 units 0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Town Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>The site is a brownfield site. Allocated in the Local Plan. Deliverable site suggest put forward for reallocation in SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The site is a brownfield site. Allocated in the Local Plan. Deliverable site suggest put forward for reallocation in SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and</strong></td>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated in previous local plan for 14 units, planning application submitted</strong></td>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>but not yet determined. W/10/00227 refers.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No - flood zone 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes - residential</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TBC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes -130m</strong></td>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes - school 550m, shops 1230m, doctors surgery 1170m, community hall 1170m, employment opportunity 1010m.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14 units 0.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Town Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site is a brownfield site. Allocated in the Local Plan. Deliverable site suggest put forward for reallocation in SWDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The site is a brownfield site. Allocated in the Local Plan. Site has now been built out for 7 dwellings following grant of planning permission.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

- **SHLAA site reference**: 71-06 - Garage, High St

- **Landowner(s)** have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

- **Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.**
  - No flood zone 1 - but adjacent to floodplain.

- **Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**
  - Yes

- **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**
  - TBC

- **Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**
  - No in principle objection from Severn Trent

- **Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**
  - No

- **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.**
  - Yes - residential, pub and commercial uses surround the site - site suitable for mixed use.

- **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**
  - TBC

- **There is not significant net loss of protected open space?**
  - No

- **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**
  - Site is within the Conservation Area - but a sensitively designed scheme would improve the appearance of the CA.

- **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).**
  - The New Inn which adjoins the site and a row of properties in the High St opposite the site are all Grade 2 listed buildings. However, a sensitively designed scheme would improve the setting of these listed buildings.

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**
  - No

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**
  - No

- **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**
  - No

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**
  - No

- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**
  - No

- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.**
  - No

- **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).**
  - Approximately one-third of the site is categorised as less risk of surface water flooding.

- **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**
  - No

- **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).**
  - TBC

- **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No**
  - Yes - 180m.

- **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**
  - school 410m, shop 180m, drs surgery 230m, community hall 230m, employment opportunity 590m

- **Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?**
  - 20 units 0.6%

- **Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.**
  - No Town Plan

- **The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.**

  - The site is a brownfield site, mostly vacant within the Conservation Area. Allocated in the Local Plan, current undetermined planning application on site W/07/02468. The New Inn which adjoins the site and a row of properties in the High St opposite the site are all Grade 2 listed buildings. However, a sensitively designed scheme would improve the setting of these listed buildings. Deliverable site suggest put forward for reallocation in SWDP - mixed use site.

### OTHER CRITERIA

- **Site ruled in or out of SWDP In**

**Summary**

- **In Summary**
  - The site is a brownfield site, mostly vacant within the Conservation Area. Allocated in the Local Plan, current undetermined planning application on site W/07/02468. The New Inn which adjoins the site and a row of properties in the High St opposite the site are all Grade 2 listed buildings. However, a sensitively designed scheme would improve the setting of these listed buildings. Deliverable site suggest put forward for reallocation in SWDP - mixed use site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Criteria</th>
<th>Other Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td><strong>Out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes - mixture of retail, residential and commercial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Within the Conservation Area, sensitive scheme could enhance CA, but note refusal of residential scheme in 2007</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Several listed buildings adjoin the site, but sensitive scheme could enhance their setting.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes - but low risk.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).</strong></td>
<td><strong>TBC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>120m</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td><strong>School 520m, shop 20m, drs surgery 500m, community hall 500m, employment opportunity 640m</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td><strong>22 units 0.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No Town Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The site is to the rear of the High St and only glimpses of it can be seen from the High St. However, it is within the Conservation Area, adjoins several listed buildings and can be viewed from King George Way. A sensitive redevelopment of the site would enhance the area - but close to floodplain and access could be problematic. Also 2009 refusal on part of site because conflicted with aims of Conservation Area Appraisal adopted 2007.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>71-15 - High St, Pershore</th>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocated In Local Plan for 40 units on a mixed use site. Refusal for renewal residential scheme on part of site - w/07/01888 - and dismissed at appeal - impact on Conservation Area following adoption of Pershore CA Appraisal.</td>
<td>71-15 - High St, Pershore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The site is to the rear of the High St and only glimpses of it can be seen from the High St. However, it is within the Conservation Area, adjoins several listed buildings and can be viewed from King George Way. A sensitive redevelopment of the site would enhance the area - but close to floodplain and access could be problematic. Also 2009 refusal on part of site because conflicted with aims of Conservation Area Appraisal adopted 2007.
### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s)</td>
<td>have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site</td>
<td>not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Discussion with developer ongoing with access being agreed from Besford Road. New footway from site to existing bus stop in Worcester Road required. If development proceeds then consideration will be given to extending speed limit along Besford Road from Worcester Road to The Holloway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Potentially interesting grassland, hedgerow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>There are two areas (less than 10% of total site area) categorised as less risk of surface water flooding. The remainder is unaffected according to the SFRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 2 land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</td>
<td>Low risk - phase 1 with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 250m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>School 1km, shop 1km, drs surgery 800m, employment 1km, community hall 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>(62 units) 2% (but Hannick Homes pre-app consultation for approx 50 units 1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Town Plan. SAP responses - 23 for and 15 against. For - rounds off town without encroaching too much on green areas, not liable to flooding, access already provided, reasonably unobtrusive. Against - elevated and visually prominent, wildlife haven, would impair approach to Pershore, unreliable water and electricity supply, sewerage/drainage problems, road already congested and used as a rat run, potential overlooking of adjoining bungalows, increase of hazardous junction at Besford Road and Worcester Road, awkward shaped site, potential for noise/smell nuisance from neighbouring farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

- **SHLAA site reference**: 71-17 - outline planning permission granted on appeal, Reserved matters in for consideration.
- **Landowner(s)** have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).
- **Check Site** not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.
- **Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?** Yes
- **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.** Discussion with developer ongoing with access being agreed from Besford Road. New footway from site to existing bus stop in Worcester Road required. If development proceeds then consideration will be given to extending speed limit along Besford Road from Worcester Road to The Holloway.
- **Sewerage and Water supply adequate?** No in principle objection from Severn Trent
- **Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.** No
- **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?** No
- **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.** Yes - residential to south
- **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?** Potentially interesting grassland, hedgerow
- **There is not significant net loss of protected open space?** No
- **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?** No
- **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).** No
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.** No
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.** No
- **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.** No
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.** TBC
- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.** TBC
- **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).** There are two areas (less than 10% of total site area) categorised as less risk of surface water flooding. The remainder is unaffected according to the SFRA.
- **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.** Grade 2 land
- **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)** Low risk - phase 1 with application
- **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.** Yes - 250m
- **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?** School 1km, shop 1km, drs surgery 800m, employment 1km, community hall 800m
- **Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?** (62 units) 2% (but Hannick Homes pre-app consultation for approx 50 units 1.6%)
- **Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.** No Town Plan. SAP responses - 23 for and 15 against. For - rounds off town without encroaching too much on green areas, not liable to flooding, access already provided, reasonably unobtrusive. Against - elevated and visually prominent, wildlife haven, would impair approach to Pershore, unreliable water and electricity supply, sewerage/drainage problems, road already congested and used as a rat run, potential overlooking of adjoining bungalows, increase of hazardous junction at Besford Road and Worcester Road, awkward shaped site, potential for noise/smell nuisance from neighbouring farm

- **Site ruled in or out of SWDP**: Out

**Summary**: Tri-angular parcel of land at periphery of town. Farm opposite. Views over site to Abbey Tower - site elevated. Discussion with developer ongoing with access being agreed from Besford Road. New footway from site to existing bus stop in Worcester Road required. If development proceeds then consideration will be given to extending speed limit along Besford Road from Worcester Road to The Holloway. Outline planning permission now granted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes - available within 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No - flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>This site has no direct access to a highway. If it were to be developed then a road connection between Conningsby Drive and the approved development 71-24 should be formed. This raises the question of ransom strips and therefore its considered that this site will be very difficult to achieve a suitable access to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>This site has no direct access to a highway. If it were to be developed then a road connection between Conningsby Drive and the approved development 71-24 should be formed. This raises the question of ransom strips and therefore its considered that this site will be very difficult to achieve a suitable access to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes - residential to north and east, approval granted for residential to south, open countryside to west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Ponds require buffer, check for amphibians, some old boundary features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>BAP within 25m. Pools on edge of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td>BAP within 25m. Pools on edge of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>BAP within 25m. Pools on edge of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>Grade 1 land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Grade 1 land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 1 land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).</td>
<td>Low risk - phase 1 with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes - 150m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no stats distance.</td>
<td>School 710m, shop 190m, doctors 1020m, community hall 1080m, employment 600m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>(26 units) - 0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No Town Plan. SAP consultation responses - 21 for and 16 against. For - rounds off the town without encroaching too much on green areas, not liable to flooding, only if adjoining site developed, reasonably unobtrusive. Against - loss of green fields, wildlife haven - great crested newts in ponds, increase traffic congestion, limited school places in Pershore, poor access, strain on utilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Town Plan. SAP consultation responses - 21 for and 16 against. For - rounds off the town without encroaching too much on green areas, not liable to flooding, only if adjoining site developed, reasonably unobtrusive. Against - loss of green fields, wildlife haven - great crested newts in ponds, increase traffic congestion, limited school places in Pershore, poor access, strain on utilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Access would have to be off Conningsbury Drive - is this feasible? Otherwise good site located between existing housing on Conningsbury Drive and recent approval for housing on Bloor's site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Access would have to be off Conningsbury Drive - Pools at northern tip of site - newts? Otherwise good site located between existing housing on Conningsbury Drive and recent approval for housing on Bloor's site. Grade 1 agricultural land - but very small parcel of land - so any loss is considered insignificant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

| **Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA)** | Yes - available now |
| **Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.** | No. Flood zone 1 |
| **Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?** | Yes |
| **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.** | The size of the site identified would automatically identify the need for a roundabout on the B4084, due to the vertical alignment of the road this may be difficult to achieve. No direct access to the B4084 will be permitted. |
| **Sewerage and Water supply adequate?** | No in principle objection from Severn Trent |
| **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?** | No |
| **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.** | Yes - open countryside with single farm dwelling nearby |
| **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?** | Adjacent woodland on southern edge, hedgerow network |
| **There is not significant net loss of protected open space?** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.** | TBC |
| **There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.** | TBC |
| **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).** | There is a very small area categorised as less risk of surface water flooding, but most of road frontage to Allesborough Hill is marked as intermediate risk. Remainder of site is unaffected according to the SFRA. |
| **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.** | Part grade 2 and part grade 3. |
| **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).** | Low risk - phase 1 with application |
| **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.** | Yes - bus stop approx 250m |
| **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?** | School 940m, shop 976m, drs surgery 806m, emp opportunities 760m, community hall 140m |
| **Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?** | (808) 25% |
| **Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.** | No Town Plan. |
| **The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.** | Arch advise: historic landscape character - selling and visual impact issues relating to Mt Pleasant and topography. Historic Environment Records increasing potential towards SW of area. |
| **Site ruled in or out of SWDP** | Out |

### OTHER CRITERIA

<p>| <strong>Summary</strong> | This is a very large site - it is too big to be considered as non-strategic. It extends from Worcester Road in the west to Pershore Hall in the east comprising a wide strip of land to the rear of houses on north-west side of Station Road. It is visually prominent and would require the provision of a roundabout on worcester Road. It is sited beyond the belt of trees which form a firm boundary to this part of Pershore. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>71-32 - partly in floodplain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANDOWNER(S) HAVE CLEARLY INDICATED THAT THE SITE IS AVAILABLE AND CAN BE DEVELOPED WITHIN THE PLAN PERIOD, (E.G. THROUGH SHLAA):</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHECK SITE NOT WITHIN FLOOD ZONE 3A OR 3B. STATE FLOOD ZONE:</strong></td>
<td>Southern edge of site within flood zone 3a - approx 20% of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE MORE THAN 450 METRES OF HAZARDOUS PIPELINE OR GAS COMPRESSION STATION?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE SITE CAN ACCOMMODATE SAFE ACCESS ONTO THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY.</strong></td>
<td>Access directly from Defford Road could be considered but this may impact on the recently constructed flood relief works. Access to the A4104 will be strongly resisted, therefore it is anticipated that it will not be possible to access this site. No direct access to the A4104 will be permitted, but will be considered for Defford Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEWERAGE AND WATER SUPPLY ADEQUATE?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE WOULD NOT COMPROMISE INTERNATIONALLY OR NATIONALLY DESIGNATED SITE OF ECOCLOGICAL IMPORTANCE.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IS THE SITE IN GREEN BELT YES/NO?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE ADJACENT/SURROUNDING LAND USES ARE COMPATIBLE WITH RESIDENTIAL AMENITY. YES/NO, PLEASE STATE TYPE.</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THERE IS NO ADVERSE IMPACT ON GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK?</strong></td>
<td>Hedgerow connectivity, developing scrub woodland, potential relic orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT NET LOSS OF PROTECTED OPEN SPACE?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THERE IS NO DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON A CONSERVATION AREA?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THERE IS NO DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON LISTED BUILDING(S).</strong></td>
<td>No - chapel in cemetery is listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THERE IS NO DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON A SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENT.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THERE IS NO DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON A SPECIAL WILDLIFE SITE / LOCAL NATURE RESERVE / REGIONALLY IMPORTANT GEOLOGICAL SITE OR ANY OTHER LOCALLY DESIGNATED WILDLIFE/LANDSCAPE SITE.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THERE IS NO DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THERE IS NO DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON A STRATEGIC GAP.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THERE IS NO DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON ANCIENT WOODLAND.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THERE IS NO DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON ANCIENT HEDGEROW.</strong></td>
<td>Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE SITE HAS NOT BEEN SUBJECT TO A SURFACE WATER FLOODING EVENT (CHECK SFRA) AND IF SO THERE IS A VIVABLE ENGINEERING SOLUTION TO OVERCOME IT (CONFIRM WITH LAND DRAINAGE ENGINEER).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOULD NOT RESULT IN LOSS OF BEST OR MOST VERSATILE (GRADE 1 OR 2) AGRICULTURAL LAND.</strong></td>
<td>No - Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOT CONTAMINATED LAND NOR LIKELY TO BE DETRIMENTALLY AFFECTED BY CONTAMINATED LAND. (CONFIRM WITH CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER).</strong></td>
<td>Low risk - phase 1 with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT (BUS STOP) IS WITHIN 400M OF THE SITE? YES/NO IF NO STATS DISTANCE.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - on site boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAS REASONABLE ACCESS TO LOCAL SERVICES, USUALLY WITHIN 800M FROM PROPOSED SITE?</strong></td>
<td>School 1020m, shop 540m, drs surgery 980m, emp opportunities 780m, community hall 1060m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOULD NOT INCREASE TOTAL HOUSING STOCK AS AT APRIL 2010 BY MORE THAN 10%?</strong></td>
<td>No - 29 units 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOULD ASSIST IN DELIVERING / SUPPORTING IDENTIFIED COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS E.G. IN PARISH PLAN.</strong></td>
<td>No Town Plan. SAP responses - 2 for - affects few people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFFORD ROAD FORMS FIRM BOUNDARY TO SOUTH OF TOWN AND DEVELOPMENT HERE WOULD APPEAR INCONGRUOUS. ACCESS DIRECTLY FROM DEFFORD ROAD COULD BE CONSIDERED BUT THIS MAY IMPACT ON THE RECENTLY CONSTRUCTED FLOOD RELIEF WORKS. ACCESS TO THE A4104 WILL BE STRONGLY RESISTED, THEREFORE IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT IT WILL NOT BE POSSIBLE TO ACCESS THIS SITE. NO DIRECT ACCESS TO THE A4104 WILL BE PERMITTED, BUT WILL BE CONSIDERED FOR DEFFORD ROAD.</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

Defford Road forms firm boundary to south of town and development here would appear incongruous. Access directly from Defford Road could be considered but this may impact on the recently constructed flood relief works. Access to the A4104 will be strongly resisted, therefore it is anticipated that it will not be possible to access this site. No direct access to the A4104 will be permitted, but will be considered for Defford Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>71-38 land adj Abbey Springs, ne of cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The site identified does not have a frontage to any public highway. It does however abut the J.S. Bloor Homes site currently under construction (planning approval 10/02127). The approved planning layout shows that a cul-de-sac in the vicinity of the proposed site but it appears to abut land to the west of this site rather than the site frontage abutting the development proposal. It is therefore concluded that this site cannot be suitably accessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Tiddesly Wood not immediately adjacent but nearby approx. m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Partly - neighbouring uses agriculture, residential and cemetery. But concern raised about impact on cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Cemetery chapel is a listed building. Also, the cemetery is a designed landscape which has recently had a lot of development on the boundary. To enclose the cemetery with more new development would have an adverse impact on the designed landscape because it diminishes its setting. The cemetery is visually connected to the landscape beyond the walled boundaries this means that the wider landscape (setting) makes a significant contribution to the overall design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Tiddesley Wood SSSI nearby but not immediately adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</td>
<td>Possible overland flood flows from higher ground to the NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer).</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 340m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Shop 830m, school 1200m, doctors 1200m, employment 980m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>no - 1.23 ha 37 units at 30 dph, 49 units at 40 dph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No town plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>The cemetery is a designed landscape which has recently had a lot of development on the boundary. To enclose the cemetery with more new development would have an adverse impact on the designed landscape because it diminishes its setting. The cemetery is visually connected to the landscape beyond the walled boundaries this means that the wider landscape (setting) makes a significant contribution to the overall design. In addition there is no obvious access. The site is therefore not considered deliverable or desirable and has not been suggested as an allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cemetery is a designed landscape which has recently had a lot of development on the boundary. To enclose the cemetery with more new development would have an adverse impact on the designed landscape because it diminishes its setting. The cemetery is visually connected to the landscape beyond the walled boundaries this means that the wider landscape (setting) makes a significant contribution to the overall design. In addition there is no obvious access. The site is therefore not considered deliverable or desirable and has not been suggested as an allocation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site, an area of public open space has pedestrian access from Mill Lane Close to both the north and south. Both accesses shown are restricted in width to a minimum of 2m, neither of which are suitable to form a vehicular access to the site without additional land. Observations on site were that should the purchase of additional land be pursued in order to form a new access, it would be best to concentrate efforts towards the southern end as there is less of a restriction in this area.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The adjacent/ surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</strong></td>
<td>Yes - residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>The land is protected open space in the adopted Local Plan, is only 0.13ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC - but probably no</td>
<td>Yes - 210m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td><strong>School 830m, shop 900m, drs surgery 1260m, emp opportunities 600m, community hall 1260m</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 dwellings (at 30dph) and 5 (at 40 dph)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No town plan. Loss of small area of open space, would impact directly on 7 homes and indirectly many more.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The loss of this small area of open space is unlikely to have a significant impact on the character of the area - it is located on the periphery of the town. But may have more important role as open space if the land to the east is developed for housing - albeit separated from this by a mature hedge.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Could have some potential but will only accommodate a max of 5 dwellings and this might be at a push. Also, lack of appropriate existing access and would require purchase of additional land so may be financially unviable.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Wychavon Category 1 Villages**

**Badsey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>06-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>Available now; landowner support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Yes and No - County Highways Team express concerns with the site as a whole. Limited frontage development taking direct access from Brewers Lane would be acceptable. Brewers Lane is considered inappropriate in width to serve a development in the magnitude of 62 properties when sites 06-02 and 06-16 are considered as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Yes more than 450m away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes and No - County Highways Team express concerns with the site as a whole. Limited frontage development taking direct access from Brewers Lane would be acceptable. Brewers Lane is considered inappropriate in width to serve a development in the magnitude of 62 properties when sites 06-02 and 06-16 are considered as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes and No - County Highways Team express concerns with the site as a whole. Limited frontage development taking direct access from Brewers Lane would be acceptable. Brewers Lane is considered inappropriate in width to serve a development in the magnitude of 62 properties when sites 06-02 and 06-16 are considered as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes and No - County Highways Team express concerns with the site as a whole. Limited frontage development taking direct access from Brewers Lane would be acceptable. Brewers Lane is considered inappropriate in width to serve a development in the magnitude of 62 properties when sites 06-02 and 06-16 are considered as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site is in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - residential/horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>YES potential impact - Developing scrub; formal and informal recreation; relic orchard on eastern part of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>SWFR - Less risk covers half of site in north and a small patch of 'Intermediate Risk' to North east of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>No - 450m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>(2 out of 5) School - Y (500m), VH - N (1.3 km), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park)- N (2.3km), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - Y (800m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>No will not increase housing stock 1.9 ha = 57 units @30dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No Parish Plan. SAP response - Provide site for a modest well integrated scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>No - if frontage only development. Need to take GI comments into account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Site is accessible to some local facilities and adjs sports ground. Potential for developing this site but only for frontage development.
SHLAA site reference | 06-03 - Duplicated with 06-03B and 06-04B and 06-04

| Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary | Available in 5 years; Landowner supportive. |
| Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone. | Usable floodplain |
| Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | Yes more than 450m away |

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. No - County Highways Team express concerns with this site as the whole of the site (including 06-03b, 06-04b, 06-04 and 06-12) would need to come forward to make the site viable. Potentially access could be achieved by realigning the junction of B4035 / B4035. A new traffic controlled or roundabout junction will the a minimum requirement designed in accordance with DMRB. No individual access will be permitted directly from Badesley Road B4035. Major road improvements would be required (at cost approx £600,000).

| Sewerage and Water supply adequate? | No in principle objection from Severn Trent |

| Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. | No |

| Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? | No |

| The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. | Yes- residential/horticulture |

| There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | No |

| There is no significant net loss of protected open space? | No |

| There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? | No |

| There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s). | No |

| There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. | No SAM |

| There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. | Yes - BAP within 25m |

| There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. | No |

| There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. | No |

| There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. | No. But mature Trees to south |

| There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow. | No |

| The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it. | SWFR - 'Less risk' and 'Intermediate Risk' through the site. |

| Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. | Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map. |

| Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. | TBC |

| Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance. | Yes - 200m |

| Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site? | (3 out of 5) School - Y (450m), VH - Y (700m), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park)- N (2.1km), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - Y (500m) |

| Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? | Yes would increase housing stock. 4.4 ha = 132 units @30dph |

| Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan. | No Parish Plan. SAP response - Proximity to the school, increase in traffic, pressure on utilities and services. Flooding and access, Negative impact on the rural edge of village. The site was also identified as being suitable for a cemetery, Suitable for a small development. Currently derelict and unsightly. Could provide a site for a comprehensive, long term scheme to meet future needs of the village. 1 support / 10 against this site. |

| The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement. | YES would affect the character of village. Large site with implications on the highway infrastructure. |

| Site ruled in or out of SWDP | Out |

<p>| Summary | Site is not considered suitable for future development. Multiple ownership. Site only suitable if all the sites come together as one - due to the improvements required to the road. See County Highway comments above. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>06-03B - Duplicated with 06-03 AND 06-04B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Submitted by agent, Landowner attitude not stated, availability unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Yes more than 450m away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No - County Highways Team express concerns with this site. Major road improvements would be required (at cost approx £600,000) and therefore the whole of the site (including 06-03, 06-04b, 06-04and 06-12) would need to come forward to make the site viable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of wastewater treatment or flood control facility?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/No, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential/horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No. But mature Trees to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>SWFR - ‘Less risk’ and ‘Intermediate Risk’ to south of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 200m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>(3 out of 5) School - Y (450m), VH - Y (700m), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park) - N (2.1km), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - Y (500m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No would not increase housing stock. 1.83 ha @30dph = 55units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan. SAP responses • Suitable for a small development. • Currently derelict and unsightly. • Could provide a site for a comprehensive, long term scheme to meet future needs of the village. • Flooding and access. • Negative impact on the rural edge of village. • The site was also identified as being suitable for a cemetery. 1 support / 10 against this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>YES would affect the character of village. Large site with implications on the highway infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site is not considered suitable for future development. Multiple ownership. Site only suitable if all the sites come together as one - due to the improvements required to the road. See County Highway comments above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>06-04 - Duplicated with 06-03 &amp; 06-04B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>Landowners not known and unknown availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Outside floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes more than 450m away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>No - County Highways Team express concerns with this site. Access to this site is severely restricted. Major road improvements would be required (at cost approx £600,000) and therefore the whole of the site (including 06-03, 06-03b, 06-04b, and 06-12) would need to come forward to make the site viable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - BAP within 25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No. But mature Trees to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - 120m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>(2 out of 5) Shop - Y (750m), School - N (1131m), VH - Y (600m), Employment (Blackminster Bus Park) - N (1137m), Doctors - N (not present in Village)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>No would not increase housing stock. 0.67 ha @ 30 dph = 19units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>YES would affect the character of village. Large site with implications on the highway infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site is not considered suitable for future development. Multiple ownership. Site only suitable if all the sites come together as one - due to the improvements required to the road. See County Highway comments above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>06-04B - Duplicated with 06-03 and 06-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA)</td>
<td>Landowner supportive, availability unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Outside floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes more than 450m away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No - County Highways Team express concerns with this site. Access from Hither Green, a cul-de-sac leading to 06-03B has restricted visibility at its junction with Badsey Road to the west due to individual frontages, therefore not considered appropriate. Previous development proposals refused using this access. Major road improvements would be required (at cost approx £600,000) and therefore the whole of the site (including 06-03, 06-03B, 06-04 and 06-12) would need to come forward to make the site viable. The formation of a direct access from the B4035 is considered difficult to form due to the S bends to the west of the site, which restrict visibility. There is a known accident record at the B4035 / B4085 junction. Previous discussions with interested parties have suggested that a new roundabout could be provided at this junction from which an access in to the site could be formed. Site observations are that this may not be possible, so further investigation is required before allocating this site, if access is to be taken via this means. Hither Green provides an alternative access solution. The junction with the B4035 is acceptable and the existing carriageway width is considered suitable to serve a development of 25 dwellings (including those already occupied). If a suitable access could be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes- residential/ horticulture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued overleaf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>06-04B - Duplicated with 06-03 and 06-04 Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Yes - BAP within 25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No. But mature Trees to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>SWFR - 'Less risk' and 'Intermediate Risk' bordering the south of the site. No known flooding events (Engineers). The ditch/ordinary watercourse here may require further assessment to ascertain whether there are flood zones present (EA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 270m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>(3 out of 5) School - Y (500m), VH - Y (750m), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park)- N (2.1km), Doctors - Not present in Village. Shop - Y (550m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes would increase housing stock. 5.1 ha @30dph = 153 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan. SAP response - 1 Support / 4 against site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>YES would affect the character of village. Large site with implications on the highway infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site is not considered suitable for future development. Multiple ownership. Site only suitable if all the sites come together as one - due to the improvements required to the road. See County Highway comments above. No objection from Landscape Officer but subject to native buffer planting to rural interface</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER CRITERIA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>06-07 - Land off Banks Road. ALLOCATED SWDP SITE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes more than 450m away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes - Land between Banks Road and site boundary subject to previous planning consent for housing, access through this site to 06-07 from Banks Road acceptable, subject to road widths being checked. Junction of Banks Road and Birmingham Road acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes more than 450m away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - adj residential /fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>No SWFR risk identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes -130m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>(1 out of 5) School - N (950m), VH - Y (700m), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park) - N (2.1km), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - N (900m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>No would not increase housing stock: 1.91 ha @30dph = 57 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No Parish Plan, SAP response - • Utilities unable to cope. • Access problems. • Outside the settlement boundary. 0 support / 2 against site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>No would not affect the character of the village. Affordable housing site already approved on part of site adj Banks Road / Telephone Exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site is the preferred site for Badsey's housing allocation and is considered the most suitable for future development. An application for 16 affordable housing units has been approved on part of this site (directly off Banks Road). At present the site is currently land locked and access is unaccessible but we have had confirmation from the Agent that the layout on the affordable housing site will incorporate an access route through to 06-07 site. Highways supportive provided road widths are checked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>06-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Landowner supportive and available now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Outside floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes more than 450m away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No Highway comment made. SHLAA submission suggests access could be off Packs Close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - adj residential /fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes could have an impact. Ecologically interesting piece of land to the northern boundary; connectivity to river corridor; likely to require buffering; western boundary could offer connectivity for bats in neighbouring settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled/ Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC with GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>SWFR - 'More risk' and 'Intermediate Risk' bordering the north of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 300m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>(3 out of 5) School - Y (600m), VH - Y (110m), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park)- N (2.3km), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - Y (500m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No would not increase housing stock 3.25 ha @30 dph = 97 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan. No SAP response comment, 1 against site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No would not affect the character of the site but access has not been assessed by Highways Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site is not considered suitable for future development. Access has not been assessed by Highways Team. Other sites on this side of the village would be more preferable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>06-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Landowners supportive and available IN 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Outside floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes more than 450m away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No - Badsey Lane is narrow with no footway provision and situated in the middle of village. It is not considered appropriate in alignment to able to serve additional development. The site frontage is extensively covered by mature trees which will affect the developers ability to secure a suitable access design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes adj residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes could have an impact. Strong connectivity; mature trees; proximity to brook; strong visual and amenity value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Adj Conservation Area but Conservation Team do not see an issue with this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Two LB adj site - Barn cottage and Orchard Cottage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Yes - SWS within 100m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No - but mature trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>SWFRA - 'Intermediate Risk' and 'More Risk' through the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 190m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>(2 out of 5) School - Y 325m), VH - N (960m), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park)- N (2.3km), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - Y (480m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No would not increase housing stock. 0.29 ha @30dph =10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan. No SAP response comment, 1 against site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Yes would affect character, difficult to access site. Narrow track and would be on risen land, other sites in Badsey preferable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER CRITERIA

<p>| Summary | This site is not considered suitable for future development. Narrow track leading to this site and difficult to access the site. Highway concerns on this site. Other sites in Badsey preferable. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Landowners supportive and available now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>South West of site in Floodzone 3. Remainder of site outside floodplain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes more than 450m away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No - Difficult to access the site due to road gradients and vehicle speeds along Badsey Road. Access from Synyhurst Avenue and Manor Close would involve third party land and would severely impact upon the existing highway network. No individual accesses will be permitted off Badsey Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes adj residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>YES would have an impact - Badsey Brook corridor (well wooded along western boundary) requires significant buffering; eastern hedgerow could provide connectivity for bats roosting in settlement; potential hydrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>YES an impact on SWS – 100M, Badsey Brook corridor (well wooded along western boundary) requires significant buffering; eastern hedgerow could provide connectivity for bats roosting in settlement; potential hydrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>SWFR - ‘Intermediate Risk,’ ‘More Risk’ and ‘Highways Flooding Area’ bordering the south west of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 280m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>(2 out of 5) School - N (1 km), VH - Y (15km), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park) - N (2.3km), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - Y (550m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No would not increase housing stock. 1.8 ha @30dph =54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan. SAP response (1) - Good access via foot/cycle to local facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Yes would affect the character of the village if dry large site on entrance to village. Access concerns from Highways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? Yes more than 450m away

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. No - County Highways Team express concerns with this site. Greenleys a cul-de-sac leading to 06-03B from the High Street is not considered suitable due to its alignment and the potential impact the development may have on existing junctions in the village. Major road improvements would be required (at cost approx £600,000) and therefore the whole of the site (including 06-03, 06-03b, 06-04 and 06-12) would need to come forward to make the site viable.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate? No in principle objection from Severn Trent

Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. Yes/no, please state type. Adj residential / horticultural

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? TBC

There is no significant net loss of protected open space? No

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? No

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)? No

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument? No SAM

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. YES - SAF within 25m.

The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it. No SWFR risk identified

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance. Yes - 180m

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? 2 out of 5) School - N (1km), VH - Y (600m), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park) - N (2.3km), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - Y (550m)

Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? No would not increase housing stock, 0.84 ha @30dph = 19units

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. TBC

Summary Site is not considered suitable for future development. Multiple ownership. Site only suitable if all the sites come together as one - due to the improvements required to the road. See County Highway comments above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>06-13 - Duplicated with 06-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Landowners supportive and available in 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Outside floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes more than 450m away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No Highway comment made as the site is duplicated and was ruled out for this reason. From Officer site visit - access is a constraint on this site as 06-07 would need to come forward first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Residential to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Yes - Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>SWFR - 'More risk' and 'Intermediate Risk' bordering the north of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 180m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>(2 out of 5) School - N (1km), VH - Y (600m), Employment (Blackminster Buss. Park)- N (2.3km), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - Y (550m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%.</td>
<td>No would not increase housing stock. 0.9 ha @30dph = 15 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan. SAP response - • Utilities unable to cope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>• Flooding risk. • Access problems. • Outside the settlement boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Site is not considered suitable for future development. Access a potential issue on this site. Site would be out on a limb and out of keeping with the existing residential form. Other sites in Badsey preferable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>06-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Landowners supportive and available now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Outside floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes more than 450m away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>No Highway comment made as the site is duplicated and was ruled out for this reason. From Officer site visit - access is a constraint on this site as 06-07 would need to come forward first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Adj residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No comments made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No comments made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>SWFR - 'More risk' and 'Intermediate Risk' bordering the north of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1998 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - 200m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>(2 out of 5) School - N (1km), VH - Y (800m), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park)- N (2.3km), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - Y (550m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 16%?</td>
<td>No would not increase housing stock. 3.18 ha @30 dph = 95 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan. No SAP response, 1 against site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>YES would affect the character of village, as access a constraint?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Site is not considered suitable for future development. Access a potential issue on this site. Site would be out on a limb and out of keeping with the existing residential form. Other sites in Badsey preferable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>06-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes more than 450m away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes and No - Badsey Fields Lane is considered not to be suitable to serve any further development other than frontage development. This approach would be supported for this site, with the developer providing a footway across the whole of the site frontage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners supportive and available now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - adj a pond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled/ Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No SMR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWFR - Patch of ‘Less risk’ within the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - 220m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 out of 5) School - Y (550m), VH - N (1.2km), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park)- N (over 2kms), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - N (850m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No would not increase housing stock 0.56 ha @30 dph = 16 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Parish Plan, No SAP response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No would not materially affect the character of the village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The site could be considered for future development but as frontage development only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>06-16 - Ruled out for duplication. Duplicated with 06-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA). <strong>Outside flood zone.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td><strong>Outside flood zone.</strong> Landowners supportive but availability unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td><strong>Yes more than 450m away</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td><strong>This site has limited highway frontage which would prevent its development in isolation. It would need to be developed in conjunction with 06-02.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td><strong>Low economic activity - The adjacent road is not suitable for use as a frontage road.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt? Yes/ No?</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td><strong>Adj residential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Developing scrub; formal and informal recreation; relic orchard on eastern part of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td><strong>No SAM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td><strong>No but Orchard on eastern part</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td><strong>SWFR - Patch of ‘Less risk’ within the site.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>TBC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes - 430m</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td><strong>(3 out of 5) School - Y (483m), VH - Y (1.2km), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park) - N (over 2km), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - Y (440m)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td><strong>Yes would affect the character of the village as the site would need to come forward with 06-02. Brewers Lane unable to cope with large development in this location.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td><strong>Out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>This site could only be considered for future development if in conjunction with site 06-02. Consider for frontage development only, due to width of Brewers Lane.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>06-26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Landowners supportive and available now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Outside Floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes more than 450m away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes - No frontage to highway. Subject to confirmation that a direct access to Bretforton Road can be provided which meets current standards access to the development site maybe possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>Adj residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No, Pond and Old Orchard trees?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No SAMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>Yes - IAP within 25m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No but old Orchard trees?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No SWFR risk identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no</td>
<td>Yes - 300m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>(1 out of 5) School - N (1.4km), VH - Y (800m), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park) - N (over 1.5km), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - N (over 1.6km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site? (i.e in walking distance)</td>
<td>No would not increase housing stock 0.89 ha @30 dph = 26 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No parish Plan. No SAP response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td>No Parish Plan. No SAP response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td>YES at present would affect character of the village as there is no frontage to highway and direct access to Bretforton Road needs to meet current standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
This site is not considered as a suitable site for future development. Currently there is no frontage to highway and direct access to Bretforton Road needs to meet current standards. A site in this location would not be in keeping with the present development form of the village.
```
### Bredon

#### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>12-01: Farm Lane / Oak Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available in 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Frontage development to Oak Lane is considered appropriate with the developer providing a new footway across the site frontage. Southern part of site frontage is to a private road which could be made up to adoptable standards. Previous discussions on this site have involved land to the west so that the whole can be accessed off St Giles Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, residential opposite and to the north of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No. Whole site is located in the Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Mature trees; potential ridge and furrow; grassland survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No. No surface water flooding on any of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No. Phase 1 with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes- bus stop: 290m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>School: 435m, Shop: 300m, Employment Opp: 470m (Station Drive units) , Hall: 590m, Doctors: 640m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No - 30 dph = 66 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Bredon has produced a Village Design Statement: Bredon cannot accommodate a significant amount of new market housing sustainably due to the limitations of its services and infrastructure, and lack of employment. The VDS is opposed to new housing taking place at the extremities of the village where the negative landscape impacts would be greatest, and where car dependency would be highest. In addition, increasing the linearity of the village would be detrimental to the community’s cohesiveness and sense of its own identity. This view is supported by the overwhelming majority of respondents to the VDS Questionnaire (86%). The VDS has set out some general design principles they would like to see in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>It is concluded that the development of this site would have a detrimental impact upon the setting and openness of the Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP.</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Although this land is considered to be available and has not been ruled out in the SHLAA. The site is wholly within the Conservation Area. Development of this site would affect the openness of the Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>12-13: Land east of Oak Lane  SWDP ALLOCATED SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Development would be possible subject to the making up of Oak Lane to an adoptable standards. Individual properties fronting Oak Lane would be acceptable subject to improvements identified in 12-01 above. This site has no access other than through site 12-15, therefore if it were to be developed it would have to be in conjunction with site 12-15 whereby the above requirements must be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes adjacent residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Orchard; grassland survey; rail corridor on eastern boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>The site is adj the Conservation Area, site will need to be to take this into consideration in future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>TPOs on part of the site - to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Not identified on the post 1988 ALC map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low with Phase 2 Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y - 318 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>5 out of 5 services accessed. School: 413m, Shop: 334m, Doctors: 514m, Village Hall: 530m, Employment: 530m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes at 1.19ha =35. Housing allocation suggesting 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Bredon has produced a Village Design Statement: Bredon cannot accommodate a significant amount of new market housing sustainably due to the limitations of its services and infrastructure, and lack of employment. The VDS is opposed to new housing taking place at the extremities of the village where the negative landscape impacts would be greatest, and where car dependency would be highest. In addition, increasing the linearity of the village would be detrimental to the community’s cohesiveness and sense of its own identity. This view is supported by the overwhelming majority of respondents to the VDS Questionnaire (86%). The VDS has set out some general design principles they would like to see in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>No the development of this site should not affect the character of the area, as long as the Conservation Area adjacent is taken into consideration. Development would be possible subject to the making up of Oak Lane to an adoptable standards. Individual properties fronting Oak Lane would be acceptable subject to improvements identified in 12-01 above. This site has no access other than through site 12-15, therefore if it were to be developed it would have to be in conjunction with site 12-15 whereby the above requirements must be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Update: sites 12-15 &amp; 12-13 have been allocated in the SWDP. 12-15 now extends further south so 12-15 is not essential for delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>12-15 (duplicated with 12-13) SWDP ALLOCATED SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Development would be possible subject to the making up of Oak Lane to an adoptable standard. Individual properties fronting Oak Lane would be acceptable subject to improvements identified in 12-01 above. This site has no access other than through site 12-15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt? Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state why. Yes adjacent residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Orchard; grassland survey; rail corridor on eastern boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>The site is adj the Conservation Area, site will need to be taken into consideration in future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Buildings (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>TPOs on part of the site - to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgeow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Not identified on the post 1988 ALC map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. Low with Phase 2 Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y - 318 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>5 out of 5 services accessed. School: 413m, Shop: 334m, Doctors: 514m, Village Hall: 530m, Emp. Opp: 530m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes at 1.27ha = 38. Housing allocation suggesting 24 (FOR SHLAA sites 12-13 AND 12-15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Bredon has produced a Village Design Statement. Bredon cannot accommodate a significant amount of new market housing sustainably due to the limitations of its services and infrastructure, and lack of employment. The VDS is opposed to new housing taking place at the extremities of the village where the negative landscape impacts would be greatest, and where car dependency would be highest. In addition, increasing the linearity of the village would be detrimental to the community’s cohesiveness and sense of its own identity. This view is supported by the overwhelming majority of respondents to the VDS Questionnaire (86%). The VDS has set out some general design principles they would like to see in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>No the development of this site should not affect the character of the area, as long as the Conservation Area adjacent is taken into consideration. Development would be possible subject to the making up of Oak Lane to an adoptable standard. Individual properties fronting Oak Lane would be acceptable subject to improvements identified in 12-01 above. This site has no access other than through site 12-15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Update: sites 12-15 &amp; 12-13 have been allocated in the SWDP. 12-15 now extends further south so 12-15 is not essential for delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Availability Unknown</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td><strong>Subject to the required standards being met in order to provide a safe access</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>from Leamington Road (B4632), access to serve the site would be accepted from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>this road. Visibility splays in either direction of 2.4m x 43m will be a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression</td>
<td>minimum requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td><strong>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td><strong>Yes - road frontage and residential to south-east</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no not significant net loss of protected open space.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no no detrimental impact on a conservation area.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td><strong>No - Bibsworth House is listed (on the site adjacent) but this is quite some</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>distance away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td><strong>Site falls within AGLV and AONB</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td><strong>No comments made by GI group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td><strong>No comments made by GI group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td><strong>No comments made by GI group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>Some of the site falls within an area deemed to be of 'less risk' in accordance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>with the SFRA and therefore this may be an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td><strong>Site has been graded as ‘other’ in ALC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td><strong>No comments received</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if</td>
<td><strong>168m to bus stop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from</td>
<td><strong>1468m from shop / 1115m from GP / 1526m from village hall / 833m from church / 894m from employment / 324m from school</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than</td>
<td><strong>No - site area = 0.5 giving approx 15 units @ 30dph</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist In delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td><strong>Out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>This site is currently ruled out as ownership is unknown but officers consider that this site would be appropriate for development forming an important gateway site into the village and sits comfortably on the edge of the development boundary. Following on from Preferred Options consultation and Significant Changes consultation, no landowner has come forward and therefore site is not considered to be deliverable. SWDP: Site removed from plan.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Broadway**

17-04 - Land to south of Bibsworth House, Leamington Road - Ruled out - Availability unknown - rule back in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>11-17 - Garages South East of Sheldon Avenue - Ruled in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period. (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes - currently a garage site with TPO's area to the west, POS to the east,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>residential to north and school to the south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>GI comment - no issues flagged up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>Site is within AGLV and AONB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ wildlife/landscape site, Regionally Important Geological Site or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site, There is no detrimental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No comments made by GI group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>No - although there is an area adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>No - although a very small area has been flagged up on the POS area to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>east of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
<td>Site has been graded as 'other' in ALC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td>Yes - low - Phase I with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If</td>
<td>145m to Bus stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>1350m from shop / 997m from GP / 1488m from village hall / 720m from church /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>776m from employment / 206m from school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No - site area = 0.16 giving approx 5 units @ 30dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This is a small garage court site that could provide some units for the village (approx 5). Given that the site is surrounded by TPO's and POS, redevelopment would have to be undertaken sensitively. However, the site is not currently attractive and could be much improved. (5 units). SWDP: site is now deleted due to Highway concerns - Avenue too narrow and garages in use so difficulty in replacing parking capacity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SHLAA site reference
17-19: Land to East of Kingsdale Road - Ruled out - (Duplicated) rule back in Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary
Available in 5 years
Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?
Yes
Kingsdale Road is a private road owned by a Housing Association serving a number of retirement homes, over which runs a public right of way. The road width, footway provision and construction gives the appearance that it is an adopted highway and subject to meeting requirements set out under Section 37 Highways Act 1980, we would not resist its adoption if it were to be offered. The development of additional units off this road would in principle be acceptable especially if they were developed by the Housing Association. If a private development were promoted then we consider the adoption of the road and provision of a turnhead as being the minimum requirements necessary to develop this site.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate?
No in principle objections from Severn Trent
Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.
No
Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?
No
The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.
Yes - residential on 2 faces of triangle

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?
Yes - residential on 2 faces of triangle - Landscape sensitivity high - Forms part of interesting water/mature tree and grassland matrix (orchard remnants?) - need survey; footpath along north western boundary
There is not significant net loss of protected open space?
No
There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?
No
There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?
No
There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.
No
There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.
Site falls within AGLV and AONB
There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.
No
There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.
No comments made by GI group
There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.
No comments made by Gt group
The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.
Not an issue according to the SFRA
Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.
No
Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.
Yes - low - Phase I with application
Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.
419m to bus stop
Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?
975m from shop / 723m from GP / 1148m from village hall / 485m from church / 969m from employment / 518m from school
Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?
No - site area = 0.54 giving approx 16 units @ 30dph (however less units are deemed more acceptable)
Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.
No
The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement
No

Site ruled in or out of SWDP
In
Other Criteria
Summary
Forms small part of larger site with several duplications. Triangular area appears to fit in with the current character of the housing in this area. Suggest allocate area of land that fits in with line of development boundary to the west - giving approx 12 units. Consider part of site should be ruled back in SWDP. Allocate for 12 dwellings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>17-20 - Land West of Leamington Road - Ruled in - this comprises 17-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>Available now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Direct access would be permitted from Station Road subject to design and level of allocation. Higher numbers may require dedicated right turn facility. No individual access points to Leamington Road will be discouraged. Consideration should be considered to improving lighting along site frontage and the provision of a controlled crossing point to assist in access Primary school. Potential ransom situation exists with accessing the site from Phillips Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - southern edge of site will abut residential and road frontage to east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>GI comment - Landscape sensitivity high - Strong hedgerow network, footpath access across site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Site falls within AONB and majority falls within the AGLV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Possibly - see GI group comments above (strong hedgerow network)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Small pocket of land deemed as 'less risk' to the northern edge of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Western part of site falls within land classified as Grade 2 so this will be an issue - to the east site falls within Grade 3b in ALC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Yes - low - Phase I with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>351m to bus stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>1295m from shop / 934m from GP / 1495m from Village Hall / 1564m from church / 705m from employment / 165m from school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes, slightly - site area = 5.3 giving approx 159 units @ 30dph (59 if just eastern part of site developed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>No - if only part of site (17-05) developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

This is a large site off Leamington Road outside the development boundary still ruled in but officers consider that only approximately half of the site to the east is appropriate for development at this time as it is closer to the main road and sits more comfortably with existing development. Also the western half of the site is subject to landscape sensitivity and agricultural land quality issues. Consider that this site (area to the west) may be more suitable for the next plan period if landscape sensitivity and agricultural land quality issues can be overcome and the eastern part of the site and the smaller site on the other side of Leamington Road (ref 17-04) come forward in the meantime. Proposed allocation for 59 units.
## Summary
Developing the whole site would not be appropriate as it opens up development to the side of Station Road. Its location is considered to be a ‘gateway entrance’ into the village. Also approx 30% of the site falls within the high risk flood zone and the site abuts a local nature reserve and SWS and much of the site falls within Grade 2 agricultural land. Proposed allocation for mixed use including 65 dwellings, nature reserve, car and coach parking, community facilities and a new enhanced football club.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>17-21: Station Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed</td>
<td>Available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1 - two-thirds of the site / Flood zone 3 - one third of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Direct access would be permitted from Station Road subject to design and level of allocation. Higher numbers may require dedicated right turn facility. Properties taking individual access from the B4632 would be acceptable. Any development will require a footway to be provided across Station Road frontage with possible improved pedestrian crossing facility of Station Road in order to provide connectivity to High Street facilities. If development were to extend to Childswickham Road then pedestrian enhancements to footway links along Childswickham Road to Cheltenham Road will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No - The site is an open field with recreational uses and a caravan site on the adjacent side. Residential lies on the opposite side of Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>GI comment - Affects a Special Wildlife Site and Local Nature Reserve -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Check to see where playing fields etc lie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Western edge of site abuts a Local Nature Reserve and SWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No comments made by GI group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No comments made by GI group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Surface water flood risk is deemed to be a problem to the south west of the site according to the SFRA - the vast majority of which is ‘intermediate risk’ - this covers approx one third of the total site area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Majority of site is within Grade 2 land with a small section Grade 3a according to the ALC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Yes - low - Phase I with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>560m to bus stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>649m from shop / 1000m from GP / 502m from village hall / 823m from church / 600m from employment / 1472m from school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes - site area = 5.74 giving approx 172 units @ 30dph (approx 20 if road frontage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would assist in delivery / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>TWII will provide additional car and coach parking, community facilities and a new enhanced football club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hartlebury**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>45-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Yes - available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Site has no access to a highway frontage other that through adjacent sites 45-05 or 45-04, therefore to be developed can only be done so in conjunction with site 45-04.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No - in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site is in Green Belt</strong></td>
<td>Yes/ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site surrounded by residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - mainly residential plus a school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No - adjacent to site - to west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No - adjacent to site - to west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>Very small part of site covered by less risk zone, remainder no risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Site is mostly on grade 2 land but part of site is on grade 1 land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Low risk - phase 1 with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - nearest approx 190m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>shop approx 150m, school 635m, village hall 920m, employment 760m, no doctors surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>Yes - by 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No Parish Plan or VDS. SAP responses - 1 for - suitable infill location, 10 against - increase congestion, poor access, loss of open character setting within village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
<td>Yes development of the site would materially affect the character of the settlement - it is too large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out see 45-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The development of the site would join together the currently separate built segments on Inn Lane and Worcester Road leaving a smaller core of open space in the centre of the village. Access could be provided from Worcester Road, and adjoining footpaths extended to link into and through the development. However, the size of this site is too great for the development to be easily assimilated into the village and although a good location, a reduced coverage would be preferred.
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes - available now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Considered as appropriate to access comprehensive development of adjacent sites 45-01, 45-05 and 45-27. Sufficient frontage for two access points from Worcester Road. Potential for third (secondary) access to Inn Lane with improvements. Individual accesses directly from Worcester Road would be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Very small part of site covered by less risk zone, remainder no risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Site is mostly on grade 2 land but part of site is on grade 1 land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low risk - phase 1 with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance...</td>
<td>Yes - nearest approx 190m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>shop approx 150m, school 635m, village hall 920m, employment 760m, no doctors surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%.</td>
<td>Yes - by 11% (1194), suggest 100?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community Infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan or VDS. SAP responses - 1 for - suitable infrastructure located, 8 against - poor access and traffic congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Less impact than 45-01 as smaller, but suggested hedgerow within the site is retained and any punctuation of it minimised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SHLAA site reference

**45-05**

### Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary

**1**

### Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

**Yes** - no availability given

### Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.

**1**

### Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?

**Yes**

### The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.

If developed in isolation to other sites then improvements to Inn Lane will be required, therefore suggest that frontage development only should be considered for this site.

### Sewerage and Water supply adequate?

**No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water**

### Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.

**No**

### Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?

**No**

### The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.

**Yes** - some residential, mainly agricultural

### There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?

**No**

### There is not significant net loss of protected open space?

**No**

### There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?

**No - adjacent to site - to west**

### There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).

**No**

### There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

**No**

### There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.

**No**

### There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.

**No**

### There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.

**No**

### There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.

**TBC**

### The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.

**Road in less risk zone, remainder no risk**

### Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.

**Site is on grade 2 land**

### Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.

**No Parish Plan or VDO. SAP responses - 0 for, 12 against - adjacent listed buildings, conservation area, detrimental impact on historic setting, wildlife designation, steep slope, poor access, traffic congestion and utilities at capacity.**

### The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.

**Difficult access, steep banks, mature planting to road frontage - would have reasonable level of impact on character of settlement.**

### Site ruled in or out of SWDP

**Out**

### Summary

Inn Lane is narrow - access difficult because of narrowness of lane and steep banks, although there are several examples of new development elsewhere along the lane to the east. Site adjoins the Conservation Area. Not preferred site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>45-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Yes - available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Site has no access to a highway frontage other than through adjacent sites 45-05 or 45-04, therefore to be developed can only be done so in conjunction with site 45-04.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - residential to north, mainly agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>Road in less risk zone, remainder no risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No - site is on grade 2 land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Low risk - phase 1 with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - nearest approx 305m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>shop approx 260m, school 530m, village hall 1km, employment 880m, no doctors surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>No - by less than 1% - 8 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No Parish Plan or VDS. No SAP responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
<td>Existing access drive from Inn Lane serves field. Footpath along eastern and southern boundaries of site. Difficult to develop in isolation as would form finger of development into central core of open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP.</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Existing access drive from Inn Lane serves field. Footpath along eastern and southern boundaries of site. Difficult to develop in isolation as would form finger of development into central core of open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary

Category 1

Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

Agent submitted site.

Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood Zone.

Not in Flood Zone.

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?

Yes

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.

If whole site to be developed access from Weston Road would be preferred. Otherwise individual accesses directly on to High Street and Weston Road would be acceptable.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate?

No in principle objection from Severn Trent

Site would not compromise International or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.

No

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?

No

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.

Yes, residential.

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?

No

There is not significant net loss of protected open space?

No

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?

No, Conservation Area within 200m.

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).

No

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

No

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.

No

There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.

No

There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.

No

There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.

No

There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.

No

The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.

Flood risk assessment submitted as part of the planning application (W/12/01020/OU).

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.

No Grade 3.

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.

No

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.

Yes. Bus 300m, railway station 1km.

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?

Yes. PH 300m; PO 180m; school 200m; village hall 350m

Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?

75 dwellings @ 30dph (site size 2.5ha)

Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.

Adopted Parish Plan promotes creation of nature reserve/woodland. Identified need for MUGA/play areas. Improvements/replacement of village hall.

The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement

Although outside Local Plan GD1 boundary the development/extension to the village could be contained by the Weston Road and High Street.

Site ruled in or out of SWDP

In

Summary

Site now has planning permission incorporating part of SHLAA 51-15 for 75 dwellings. Retained in the SWDP as a commitment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-06</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period; (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes. Within 450m of gas main.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes. Within 450m of gas main.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAJOR CRITERIA

- **Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary**
  - Yes
- **Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period; (e.g. through SHLAA).**
  - Yes
- **Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.**
  - Part within Flood Zone.
- **Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**
  - Yes. Within 450m of gas main.
- **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**
  - Yes
- **Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**
  - No in principle objection from Severn Trent
- **Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**
  - No
- **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**
  - No
- **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. **Yes/no, please state type.
  - No. Open countryside.

OTHER CRITERIA

- **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**
  - No
- **There is no significant net loss of protected open space?**
  - No
- **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**
  - No
- **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?**
  - No
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**
  - No
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**
  - No
- **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**
  - No
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**
  - No
- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**
  - No
- **There is no detrimental impact on ancienthedgerow.**
  - No
- **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.**
  - Flooding issues need to be investigated further. Flood risk assessment submitted as part of planning application.
- **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**
  - No
- **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.**
  - No
- **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.**
  - Yes. Bus stop 100m, railway station 700m.
- **Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?**
  - Yes, Village centre.
- **Would Assist in delivering / supporting Identified community Infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.**
  - Adopted Parish Plan promotes creation of nature reserve/woodland. Identified need for MUGA/play areas. Improvements/replacement of village hall.
- **The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement**
  - No. Site is outside the village form/pattern in an open location.
- **Site ruled in or out of SWDP**
  - Out
- **Summary**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Consulted on at Preferred Options stage, and Significant Change as a deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>site. Allocation not carried forward to the SWDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park of site is within Flood Zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Within 450m of gas main.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of site recently developed adjacent to 37 High Street. Access to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the remaining area, subject to achieving design requirements would be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable off the High Street at the northern end of the site. Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accesses directly on to High Street would be acceptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/</td>
<td>Adjacent to a row of detached houses. Site isolated and detached from village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, please state type.</td>
<td>form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No although access may impact on listed building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding issues need to be investigated further.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, Grade 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Bus stop 100m, railway station 1km.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Village centre 200m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Parish Plan promotes creation of nature reserve/woodland identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for MUGA/play areas. Improvements/replacement of village hall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 dwellings @ 30dph (site size 0.8ha).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge of settlement any development would effectively sit within the open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>countryside and be removed from the village form.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulted on at Preferred Options stage, and Significant Change as a deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site. Allocation not carried forward to the SWDP.</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SHLAA site reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>Category 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).**

**Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.**

Not known. Believed to be in multiple ownership.

**Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**

No. Within 450m of gas main.

**The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**

Yes, Limited site frontage to a highway. Access would have to be taken from Stratford Road forming a staggered crossroads with Mickleton Road with raising possible highway safety issues which would have to be resolved. Alternatively access could be taken from Harvard Avenue by purchasing properties, this would remove any safety concerns we may have.

**Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**

No in principle objection from Severn Trent

**Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**

No

**The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.**

Yes, residential. Although adjacent to railway line.

**Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**

No, Grade 3.

**Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.**

No

**Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.**

No. Bus stop 450m, railway station 1.5km.

**Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**

No. Village centre approx 1km.

**Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?**

100 dwellings @ 30dph (site size 3.33ha).

**Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.**

Adopted Parish Plan promotes creation of nature reserve/woodland. Identified need for MUGA/play areas. Improvements/replacement of village hall.

**The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.**

Edge of settlement and adjacent to the railway line.

**Site ruled in or out of SWDP**

Out

**Summary**

Too far removed from village centre/services/transport. Close proximity of gas main means it should have been ruled out. Not included in Preferred Options or Significant Changes. Not allocated in SWDP but could come forward in any neighbourhood plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>51-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes. Within 450m of gas main.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes Previous planning history for 4/5 properties which were found to be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, surrounded by housing. Recent affordable scheme adjacent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Adjacent to CA boundary but a sensitive development unlikely to have an adverse impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Adjacent to listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Flooding issues need to be investigated further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Contamination issues need to be investigated further due to current use as car maintenance garage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Bus stop 50m, railway station 1km.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. Village centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>5 dwellings @ 30dph (site size 0.18ha).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Adopted Parish Plan promotes creation of nature reserve/woodland. Identified need for MUGA/play areas. Improvements/replacement of village hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Yes. Sites within the village form/pattern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Small brownfield site inside the development boundary. Could deliver a modest amount but loss of garage (uncertain as to viability of this service). Not put forward as an alternative option in Preferred Options. Not allocated in the SWDP but could also serve as a possible site within any neighbourhood plan.
### Inkberrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>53-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period (e.g. through SHLAA)</td>
<td>Yes. Developer has option on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>From the drawing submitted it is unclear how access to the site will be achieved. Any development proposals in this area cause concern due to the sub standard visibility at the junction of Stonepits Lane and A422. If any development allocations are to be proposed which have an impact on this junction then it will be incumbent on the developer to resolve these sub standard junction arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Adjacent to residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site/Local Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on an ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>Strategic flood risk assessment submitted in support of planning application on SHLAA 53-7/53-5 does not indicate a significant flood issues for the site as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>No. Bus stop on High Street 500m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering/supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Parish Plan adopted in 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Consulted on at Significant Changes as part of an enlarged allocation. Site allocated in SWDP as part of a wider site incorporating SHLAA 53-7/53-5 for 100 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Recommend no development due to narrow single point of access with poor visibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
<td>No up to date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stats distance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community Infrastructure</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Not a suitable site - visually prominent, difficult access and controversial (reflected by the responses from the SAP consultation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference 53-05 - (Previously Ruled out)</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Developer has option on the site.</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pipeline close</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access can be achieved onto Withybed Lane and Stonepit Lane to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority. Issue of junction upgrade to Stonepit Lane/High Street highlighted by the County Council.</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/low risk</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No up to date information</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included in Preferred Options with SHLAA 53-7 for 90 dwellings. Enlarged site consulted on at Significant Changes that incorporated SHLAA 53-2 for 100 dwellings. Larger site allocated in the SWDP for 100 dwellings.</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>53-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Y, Developer interest unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>N/low risk. May be issue of surface run-off due to gradient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>N/low risk. May be issue of surface run-off due to gradient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td>N/low risk. May be issue of surface run-off due to gradient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if</td>
<td>N. Bus stop in High Street 500m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP.</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Not suitable, visually prominent and difficult to access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

SHLAA site reference

53-06
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt: Yes/ No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access point from Withybed Lane. Adoptable access possible with visibility requirement of 2.4m x 43m (this may require additional land not within the site) Maximum of 100 units from single access point, although 50 may be more feasible given the width of access point.</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt: Yes/ No?</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put forward at Preferred Options with SHLAA 53-05 for 90 dwellings. Further Significant Changes consultation for 100 dwellings (incorporating SHLAA 53-02). Allocated in SWDP for 100 dwellings.</td>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

312
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes. Developer has option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b; State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Due to the existing junction between Main Street and Laurels Road being considered substandard to accommodate additional development off site improvements will be required in order to develop the whole site. Individual accesses directly on to Main Street would be acceptable and due to the limited amount of site frontage improvements to Main Street and Laurels Road may not be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Possible. Currently unmanaged open space with probable habitat/biodiversity value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Protected open space under COM13. But not publicly accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Flood risk assessment submitted as part of planning application showed no flooding issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. 50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. 100m to village centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>No. Centrally located. Currently unmanaged open space without public access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-08/10</td>
<td>Reasonably well located to village centre and services/bus stop. Contained by existing road although removed from the established edge of village. Development here could lead to infilling of field to the west of the site. Need to 66-10 and 66-08 together although total site size would deliver more housing than needed. Not included in Preferred Options given loss of open aspect within this part of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA). Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone. Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to the existing junction between Main Street and Laurels Road being considered substandard to accommodate additional development off site improvements will be required in order to develop the whole site if accessed off Leasowes Road. Subject to design requirements being met access to serve this and the adjacent site 66-10 could be taken from Laurels Road which would avoid the sub standard junction between main Street and Laurels Road. Individual accesses directly on to Laurels Road would be acceptable. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it. Unknown. Would need to be assessed. Possible surface water run-off from farmland. SUDS scheme could mitigate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. Possibly Grade 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. Unknown. Farmland so unlikely to be contaminated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance. Yes. 200m to bus stop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly Grade 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? Yes, Village centre 450m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g in Parish Plan. No parish plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement Need to consider sites together. Development would create a stand alone housing area between Laurels Rd/Leasowes Rd with farmland on either side.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>66-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Leasowes Road is an unmade private road which is unsuitable to serve the development and this together with the existing junction between Main Street and Laurels Road being considered substandard to accommodate additional development the development of this site is considered inappropriate to the level of improvement work that would be required to access it. Individual accesses directly on to Leasowes Road would be acceptable subject to improvements to the carriageway and due to the limited amount of site frontage improvements to Main Street and Laurals Road may not be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Possibly Grade 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unknown. Farmland so unlikely to be contaminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. 200m to bus stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. Village centre 450m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>For combined site 50 houses at 3dph (site size 0.68/1.03ha).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Need to consider sites together. Development would create a stand alone housing area between Laurels Rd/Leasowes Rd with farmland on either side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Reasonably well located to village centre and services/bus stop. Contained by existing road although removed from the established edge of village. Development here could lead to infilling off field to the west of the site. Need to 66-10 and 66-08 together although total site size would deliver more housing than needed. Not included in Preferred Options as loss of open aspect within this part of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>66-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes. Has developer interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Immediately adjacent to residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Unknown. Would need to be assessed. Possible surface water run-off from farmland. SUDS scheme could mitigate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Possibly Grade 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unknown. Farmland so unlikely to be contaminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs i.e. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Could be considered as a stand alone site for approx 30 dwellings. Fits with settlement pattern and existing built form better than SHLAA 65-10/08 as a stand alone site. Although could be considered as part of a larger site between Laurels Rd/Leasowes Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Reasonably well located to village centre and services/bus stop. Contained by existing road although removed from the established edge of village. Not put forward to Preferred Options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SHLAA site reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>Category 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Poor access via Gibbs Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity, Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, Residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

| There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | No |
| There is not significant net loss of protected open space? | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? | Yes. Within Conservation Area. Appraisal indicates significant views and prominent open space. |
| There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s). | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. | Yes. No. But CA Appraisal identifies two significant trees along west boundary. |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. | No |
| The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it. | Unknown. Would need to be assessed. Possible surface water run-off from farmland. SUDS scheme could mitigate. |
| Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. | Possibly Grade 1 |
| Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. | Unknown. Would need to be assessed. |
| Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance. | No. 500m |
| Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? | Yes. 100-200m to village centre. |
| Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? | 6 houses at 30dph (site size 0.33ha) |
| Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan. | No parish plan. |
| The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement | Negative impact on CA, loss of views. Development would adversely effect settlement pattern of village core. |

### Summary

Site ruled in or out of SWDP

Out

Although centrally located this site has poor access and size would limit layout options. Negative impact on CA and loss of views. Recommend not to be put forward to Preferred Options. Identified as not being available at Significant Changes consultation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>66-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA)</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Laurels Avenue is an adopted highway up to and including the turning head outside No16, beyond this point the road is private, probably in the ownership of a Housing Association. The width of Laurels Avenue varies but averages at about 5m, however it was observed on site that access is restricted by parked cars and poor forward visibility around bends. The development of this site off Laurels Avenue is considered totally unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Recent residential development to south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No. Significant part of site looks to not have been recently cultivated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Unknown. Would need to be assessed. Possible surface water run-off from farmland. SUDS scheme could mitigate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Via Laurels Avenue 150m. From Leasowes Road 500m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>750m to village centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>30 houses at 30dph (site size 1ha).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No parish plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
<td>Could form infill to recent housing development to south, although just within maximum distance criteria to village centre services. Uncertain access can be achieved through the latter. Access from Leasowes Road would need upgrade and unknown whether road is adopted or private. Could form frontage to row of semi-detached houses to west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Site removed from established edge of village, but precedent of recent development to south. Suggest put forward as an alternative site in Preferred Options as site works in its favour. Allocated in the SWDP for 19 dwellings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>66-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Gibbs Lane is not considered appropriate in its current form to facilitate development. Significant improvements in its width and construction will be required which it is anticipated will require third party land. Existing junction between Main Street and Laurels Road considered substandard to accommodate additional development and will require improvements. Individual accesses directly on to Gibbs Lane would be acceptable and due to the limited amount of site frontage improvements to Main Street and Laurels Road may not be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No. Open fields, removed from the village developed boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Potentially. Boundary to west adjacent to CA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Within close proximity of numerous listed buildings along frontage of Avon Court and Gibbs Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Unknown. Would need to be assessed. Possible surface water run-off from farmland. SUDS scheme could mitigate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Possibly Grade 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unknown. Would need to be assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>No. 500m + unless connections can be achieved to Main Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. 700m to village centre. 300m if access secured via village hall car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>45 houses at 30dph (site size 1.5ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Significan level of opposition from local residents and parish council at developer led consultation event and through 2010 SHLAA events. Negative impact on views in and from CA. Site removed from village edge, with any scheme encroaching into the open countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Site included at Preferred Options. Significant level of objection. Alternative proposal emerged during Preferred Options consultation to relocate cricket club to Gibbs Lane and develop Three Cocks Lane for housing. Put forward for consultation at Significant Changes. Both sites not included in SWDP due to uncertainty relating to feasibility of relocating the cricket club and subsequent issues of deliverability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SHLAA site reference:** 66-26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. Subject to suitable access arrangements being agreed, access to this site will be acceptable.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No principle objection from Severn Trent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No. Open fields, removed from the village developed boundary. Adjacent to glass houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Possibly Grade 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Unknown. Would need to be assessed. Possible surface water run-off from farmland. SUDS scheme could mitigate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Site currently fronts onto Laurels Road so access would not be difficult. Site removed from village edge with glass houses to rear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of open access land or ancient woodlands, ancient hedges, ancient woodland, ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Unknown. Would need to be assessed. Possible surface water run-off from farmland. SUDS scheme could mitigate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Could be feasibly developed but would introduce a detached residential location. Would result in loss of horticultural use in current production. Could come forward in a neighbourhood plan.

---

**MAJOR CRITERIA**

- There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?
- There is no significant net loss of protected open space?
- There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?
- There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?
- There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?
- There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.?
- There is no detrimental impact on TPOs?
- There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap?
- There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.?
- There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.?

---

**OTHER CRITERIA**

- Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.?
- Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land?
- Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.
- Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?
- Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?
- Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.
- Site currently fronts onto Laurels Road so access would not be difficult. Site removed from village edge with glass houses to rear.
**SHLAA site reference**
67-01

**Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary**
Category 1

**Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period**.
Yes. Pre-app discussions have taken place on part of site.

**Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.**
No

**Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station**?
Yes

**The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**
Site previously considered as part of a larger development site including 67-04. Access was agreed off A4133 as Woodhall Lane was considered unsuitable to provide access given the level of development potential. Individual accesses directly off Woodhall Lane could be considered.

**Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**
No in principle objection from Severn Trent

**Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**
No

**Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**
No

**The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.**
No. Edge of settlement, with scattered dwellings surrounded by open countryside.

**There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**
No

**There is not significant net loss of protected open space?**
No

**There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**
No

**There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).**
No

**There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**
No

**There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**
No

**There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**
No

**There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**
No

**There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**
No

**There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.**
No

**The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.**
Unknown.

**Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**
Yes. Grade 1

**Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.**
Unknown. Greenfield so unlikely.

**Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.**
Yes. Bus stop within 250m.

**Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**
No. Village centre 1km

**Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?**
Unknown.

**Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.**
Adopted Parish Plan identifies issues relating to HGVs, pedestrian safety, street lighting.

**The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement**
Although deliverable it is removed from the village centre and any development would extend village northwards into open countryside. Could be access issues onto Woodhall Lane and junction with main road. Development would create a stand alone housing estate (incorporating Uttbridge House).

**Site ruled in or out of SWDP**
Out

**Summary**
SHLAA indicates could come forward as part of 67-04 but combined site would be too large for number needed. Ruled out.

---

**Table: Ombersley**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>67-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period.</strong></td>
<td>Yes. Pre-app discussions have taken place on part of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Site previously considered as part of a larger development site including 67-04. Access was agreed off A4133 as Woodhall Lane was considered unsuitable to provide access given the level of development potential. Individual accesses directly off Woodhall Lane could be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>No. Edge of settlement, with scattered dwellings surrounded by open countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Yes. Grade 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Unknown. Greenfield so unlikely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes. Bus stop within 250m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>No. Village centre 1km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Adopted Parish Plan identifies issues relating to HGVs, pedestrian safety, street lighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
<td>Although deliverable it is removed from the village centre and any development would extend village northwards into open countryside. Could be access issues onto Woodhall Lane and junction with main road. Development would create a stand alone housing estate (incorporating Uttbridge House).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>SHLAA indicates could come forward as part of 67-04 but combined site would be too large for number needed. Ruled out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>67-02</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Category 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes. Although site not deliverable without access via ‘The Racks’ site adjacent. Although the latter was allocated in the 1998 Local Plan, and has a recent planning permission for 20 houses (W/10/00732) it has not been implemented.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td><strong>The only frontage this site has to a highway is the A449. Notwithstanding potential physical constraints in forming an access on to this road it will be rigorously opposed by the Highway Authority. There is a back to the south of the site which has access to the A4133, this is a private road over which runs a public right of way, the upgrading of this route to form an access to the site will also be resisted, therefore this site cannot be developed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td><strong>To be confirmed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>To be confirmed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Residential to north but surrounded by open land.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes. Village centre 650m.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td><strong>To be confirmed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unknown.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unknown. Unlikely given greenfield.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes. Bus stop within 250m.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes. Village centre 650m.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td><strong>14 houses at 30dph (site size 0.48ha).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adopted Parish Plan identifies issues relating to HGVs, pedestrian safety, street lighting.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
<td><strong>This site can not be delivered with The Racks development moving forward. As a stand alone development, even if access across The Racks could be secured would be isolated small development within open landscape setting adjacent to A449.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>In</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>This is a good site and of those available best located to the village centre and services. As The Racks has a current permission to 2013 suggest this is put forward as the Preferred Option for 14 houses. Together with The Racks permission this will provide an total of 34 houses for the village over the plan period. Will need to establish from landowner if a developer is on board for The Racks or how they intend to move the development forward. Allocated in the SWDP for 14 dwellings.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>67-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Site previously considered as part of a larger development site including 67-1. Access was agreed off A4133 as Woodhall Lane was considered unsuitable to provide access given the level of development potential. Individual accesses directly off Woodhall Lane could be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No. Edge of settlement, with scattered dwellings surrounded by open countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Yes. Grade 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unknown. Greenfield so unlikely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Bus stop within 50m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No. Village centre 1km.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>55 houses at 30dph (site size 2.02ha).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Adopted Parish Plan identifies issues relating to HGVs, pedestrian safety, street lighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Although a deliverable site it is removed from the village centre and any development would extend the village northwards into the open countryside. Further, site capacity to large and if put forward to Preferred Options site should be for 20 dwellings. Opportunity to return development boundary to 1998 Local Plan position and return the site to open countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Allocated in the SWDP for 25 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>87-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unknown. Greenfield so unlikely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Bus stop within 250m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. Village centre just within 800m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>33 houses at 30dph (site size 1.1ha).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Adopted Parish Plan identifies issues relating to HGVs, pedestrian safety, street lighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Although a deliverable site its elevated position would mean visually prominent from views within the village and noise would be a factor from proximity to A449.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Rule out as site to prominent and A449 impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>29wy-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available now / Single ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Highways Officers have raised strong objections with additional cars using the junction of Chequers Lane and Stoke Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No, ADR but adjacent the Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC with Green Infrastructure Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC with Green Infrastructure Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No TPOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes- Currently Strategic Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC with Green Infrastructure Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No surface water flooding identified in the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>None identified on the Post 1988 ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes: 232m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (School: 738m Hall: 800m) Although the Shop further at 900m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>To enhance Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>With reduction in number of units, the development should not materially affect the character of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>None identified on the Post 1988 ALC map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes: 232m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes (School: 738m Hall: 800m) Although the Shop further at 900m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>To enhance Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>With reduction in number of units, the development should not materially affect the character of the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

This site now has planning permission (won on appeal) for 36 dwellings. Site was not allocated in SWDP due to highway concerns. The site is currently occupied by The Old Barn and Sunnyhill House and therefore the number of units suggested may need to be reduced. Suggestion of linear development to respect the character of the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>29wy-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available now / Single ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes. Possible access could be taken from Crown Lane subject to design standards being compiled with and improvements to A38 / Crown Lane junction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No, ADR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site would not compromise any Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Special wildlife site to north. Would require a buffer zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes- although site is currently a Strategic Gap, it is felt that a gap would still be maintained against the M5 by resisting development on site 29wy-03.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No surface water flooding identified in the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up-to-date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes: 150m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes generally. First School further than 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes would increase by 10% (87 units) but the SWDP proposes 60 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>To enhance Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>No. Development of this site would not detrimentally affect the character of the settlement. It is envisaged that access would be taken off Crown Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Consulted on amendment to this site in Significant Changes consultation for increased capacity for 60 dwellings. Site now has planning permission for 81 dwellings (11/02055).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Criteria</td>
<td>Other Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available now, landowner supportive.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Possible access could be taken from Crown Lane subject to design standards being complied with and improvements to A38 / Crown Lane junction. Pedestrian facilities will need improvement along Crown Lane.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available now, landowner supportive.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Possible access could be taken from Crown Lane subject to design standards being complied with and improvements to A38 / Crown Lane junction. Pedestrian facilities will need improvement along Crown Lane.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No, ADR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No, M5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Special wildlife site to north. Would require a buffer zone.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Some intermediate risk and elements of less and more risk.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes, Phase 1 survey with planning application</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes, 300m</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes generally, but not to First School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes generally, but not to First School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td><strong>To enhance Village Hall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes would affect the character of the village - currently very little development to west of A38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Out</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Considered inappropriate to develop due to scale, adjacent to M5, attractive to those seeking to re-locate from the conurbation. Site subject to surface run-off problems and poorer access to services, in particular First School.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>29wy-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. 2 access points will be required if more than 100 units are to be provided on this site. Primary access would be best taken from Church Lane subject to design standards being complied with and with possible improvements to A38 / Church Lane junction. A secondary access could be taken from Chequers Lane or Stoke Road subject to design standards being complied with and pedestrian improvements. Chequers Lane/Stoke Road and Church Lane/Stoke Road junctions may warrant improvement as possible ‘rat run’ along Stoke Road to M5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>2 access points will be required if more than 100 units are to be provided on this site. Primary access would be best taken from Church Lane subject to design standards being complied with and with possible improvements to A38 / Church Lane junction. A secondary access could be taken from Chequers Lane or Stoke Road subject to design standards being complied with and pedestrian improvements. Chequers Lane/Stoke Road and Church Lane/Stoke Road junctions may warrant improvement as possible ‘rat run’ along Stoke Road to M5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, agricultural/residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stops distance.</td>
<td>Yes: 250m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stops distance.</td>
<td>Yes: 250m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up-to-date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up-to-date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Yes, Phase 1 survey with planning application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up-to-date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Yes, Phase 1 survey with planning application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes: 250m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes: 250m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>To enhance Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>To enhance Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Considered inappropriate to develop due to scale and would encourage in-migration. In keeping more with the settlement pattern relative to the other sites. Recommend that if there is to be an allocation then it should be this site but only up to 10 units adjacent to Chequers Lane. Part of site was proposed (frontage only) in the SWDP Preferred Options for 10 dwellings. However site is now proposed to be deleted due to Highway concerns regarding additional cars using the junction of Chequers Lane and Stoke Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SHLAA site reference**: 29wy-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The existing access from A38 Worcester Road complies with DMRB standards and is considered adequate to serve up to a maximum 100 units without secondary access. Access from Walkmill Drive is considered unsuitable to serve any of this development site. Consideration could be given to providing access via this site to 29WY-2 and 29WY-3 to allow for secondary access to Crown Lane in order to maximise development potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No, ADR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Very small element of less risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No up-to-date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, 200m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>To enhance Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>No would not affect the character of the village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**: This site was considered as an alternative site to 29wy-02. However this is no longer being proposed in the SWDP, as site 29wy-02 now has planning permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>29wy-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Single / Available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No - site is 405m away from Esso pipeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Frontage access to School Road on 3 sides acceptable. Each property can be accessed via individual private drives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAJOR CRITERIA

| **Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.** | No |
| **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?** | No within the development boundary |
| **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.** | Existing club house surrounded by housing |
| **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?** | TBC |
| **There is no significant net loss of protected open space?** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.** | Yes to the north of the site |
| **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.** | TBC |
| **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.** | TBC |
| **There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.** | TBC |
| **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.** | No events identified in the SFRA. |
| **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.** | No up-to-date information |
| **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.** | TBC |
| **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.** | No, 500m |
| **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?** | 120m: School. 145m: Hall, 420m: Shop. 430m: Employment Opps - Hotel. 75m: Doctors |
| **Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?** | No - 1.8 ha @30 dph = 5 units |
| **Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.** | To enhance Village Hall |
| **The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement** | No - Within the development boundary, adjacent existing residential. |

### OTHER CRITERIA

| **Site ruled in or out of SWDP** | Out |
| **Summary** | Brownfield site to accommodate up to 6 dwellings. Would also require 20% surface water run off improvement. Site is no longer proposed in SWDP as some uncertainty regarding the re-development. Also site is within the defined development boundary and therefore could come forward during the plan period. |
**SHLAA site reference**

04-01 - Land Off Elmley Road. Ruled back in following Richard Alexander’s letter

**Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary**

2

**Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).**

Single Ownership / Available in 5 years

**Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.**

Flood Zone 1

**Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**

No

**The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**

Subject to suitable access arrangements being agreed, access to this site will be acceptable, however it is on the inside of a bend so the land take required for visibility splays will be greater and result in a significant length of hedge and tree removal. Individual accesses directly to the C2116 would be acceptable if turning facilities are provided. we would question whether or not it would be appropriate to introduce a number of access points directly outside a school entrance on grounds of highway safety

**Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**

No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

**Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**

No

**Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**

No

**The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.**

Yes School and adjacent residential

**There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**

Within the AONB

**There is no significant net loss of protected open space?**

No

**There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**

No

**There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).**

No

**There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**

No

**There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**

No

**There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**

No

**There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**

No

**There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**

No

**There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.**

No

**The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.**

Possible overland flood flows from higher ground to the West.

**Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**

No

**Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.**

No

**Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.**

Yes 120 m

**Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**

Yes 1 out of 5. – School - adj, Doctors - not in village, VH - 900m, Employment Opps – over 800m to pub, nursery, petrol station and one school, middle school adjacent.

**Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?**

N - (0.64ha = 19 units)

**Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.**

Parish Plan - 25% of responses received stated a shop in village would be welcome. Concern over the lack of affordable homes in the village

**The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement**

The site is just before a sharp bend and is within the AONB and AGLV. Potential loss of existing trees and hedges to road frontage for access and visibility splays – extent of loss would need to be considered to assess whether this would be acceptable visually and ecologically. But would be screened from Bredon Hill by existing woodland to the west. Need to consider "softening" any proposed development here as would be at the entrance to the village – native buffer planting would be required to northern/western boundaries and replacement hedge/tree planting

**Site ruled in or out of SWDP**

In

**Summary**

The site is suggested for approx 12 dwellings through the significant changes consultation. Positive assessment from the SHLAA Panel 2012. Access and visual splays need to be addressed and appropriate landscaping will need to be considered in any proposal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>04-05 - Station Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Single ownership / Available 5yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards access to The Groaten / Station Road will be acceptable. Individual accesses directly on to public highway also acceptable. The provision of a new footway across the site frontage will be a required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Adj AONB, CA and AGLV therefore would need to be in keeping with low density surroundings and sensitive design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>LB adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgeow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Part of site to east is subject to less risk surface water run off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low - Phase 1 with application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y - Adjacent the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>3 out of 5. School - 600m, Doctors - not in village, Shop - not in village, VH - 300m, Employment - 400m to Nursery, 130m to Pub, 300m to one of the schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>N - (0.69ha = 14/20 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Parish Plan - recognises that The Groaten i.e. adj the road this site is located is in poor condition and footpath and Elmley Road up to the School - opportunity for improvements if the development goes ahead? 25% of responses received stated a shop in village would be welcome. Concern over the lack of affordable homes in the village. SAP responses - Development here will keep traffic away from Elmley Road, considered as unattractive on approach to village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>The character of the area should not be affected, provided highway designs are taken into account and the building design respects the AONB area adjacent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site could come forward for potential development but as frontage development only. Highways supportive of access based on complying with acceptable design standards. provided Residential adj the site therefore in keeping with surroundings, would need to linear development as the same scale as adj residential. Scale design major consideration due to the impact on the AONB / AGLV and LB adj site. However this is the only SHLAA site in A-U-H that is not within either the AONB or AGLV. Recommend max of 6 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Single ownership / Available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Not assessed by Highways Team, but access could only be provided via 4-01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes School and adjacent residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Within the AONB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check</td>
<td>Part of the site may have ‘less risk’ difficult to pin point as off the SFRA map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes 120 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Yes 1 out of 5. - School - adj. Doctors - not in village, VH - 900m, Employment Opp. - over 800m to pub,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td>nursery, petrol station and one school, middle school adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>N - (0.64ha = 19 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td>Parish Plan - 25% of responses received stated a shop in village would be welcome. Concern over the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>lack of affordable homes in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should</td>
<td>The site is to the rear of 4-01 and could only be developed in conjunction with 4-01 because it does</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>not benefit from its own access. It is within the AONB and AGLV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

This site could only develop if access were provided through 4-01, however it is considered that this parcel of land is not required for this plan period and development is restricted to 4-01. The site is also within the CA and AGLV.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>04-11 - Site south of Middle Farm on Beckford Road. Ruled back in following agents letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Single ownership known / Available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to suitable access arrangements being agreed, access to both Beckford Road and Blacksmith Lane would be possible. However due to the restricted visibility at the junction of Blacksmiths Lane and Groaten, together with the restricted width of the carriageway along Blacksmith Lane, the preferred point of access would be from Beckford Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Within AONB and Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>LB adj - Manor Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No, but WWT advise that an allocation here may be unacceptable due to impact on orchard, further survey work required to enable assessment of impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No risk identified by the SFRA. Engineers advise this site may be subjected to flooding from the highway to the E &amp; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y - Adjacent the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>3 out of 5. School - 600m, Doctors - not in village, Shop - not in village, VH - 354m, Employment - 400m to Nursery, 130m to Pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%.</td>
<td>N - (0.57ha = 17 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community Infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Parish Plan - recognises that The Groaten i.e. adj the road this site is located is in poor condition and footpath and Elmey Road up to the School - opportunity for improvements if the development goes ahead? 25% of responses received stated a shop in village would be welcome. Concern over the lack of affordable homes in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Landscape officer advises that potentially unacceptable tree loss at entrance to village. Would be visible form Dumbleton Hill in AONB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site is not considered suitable for future development as the private garden has lots of trees on site, and their loss would be considered to harm the character of the area. Site is also adjacent a sharp bend to the east of the site and within the AONB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Beckford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>07-Feb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Available now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>TBC By Highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>TBC By Highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>Yes adj residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes adj residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>TBC BY GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>No events identified on the SFRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No up to date survey available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - 230m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>0 out of 5. Shop - over 1km, Employment Opportunity - over 1km, Village Hall - over 1km, Doctors - not present in the village, School - not present in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No Parish Plan. SAP response - if housing is increased in Beckford gas would be needed in the village and sewerage would need upgrading. Any additional housing, even outside the conservation area, needs to be in keeping with the style of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
<td>This site is outside the Conservation Area of Beckford, but is removed from the main centre of Beckford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>The site is considered too removed from facilities and services in the centre of Beckford. Separated by the A46 - facilities not easily accessible by foot. This site should not be considered for future development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**MAJOR CRITERIA**

- **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**
- **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**
- **There is no significant net loss of protected open space?**
- **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**
- **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).**
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**
- **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**
- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**
- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.**

**OTHER CRITERIA**

- **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.**
- **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**
- **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.**
- **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.**
- **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**
- **Wouldn't increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?**
- **Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.**
- **The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement**
- **Site ruled in or out of SWDP**
- **Summary**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>07-07</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Single ownership / Available now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>In order to form a suitable access into this site the mature hedge and trees along the site frontage will have to be removed in order to achieve the required visibility splay. This exacerbated by the fact that the location of the site is on the inside of a bend. If the removal of all this hedge and trees are considered acceptable, then the formation of a junction subject to meeting all current design requirements would be considered acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes adj residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Court Farm Lane is boundary to Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Listed buildings within the adjoining Conservation Area including Beckford Hall and associated buildings - but none immediately adjoining site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Backford Hall and associated buildings are scheduled ancient monuments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>There is a group TPO on trees within the Beckford Hall grounds within the northern part of the Conservation Area - none within the SHLAA site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC by GI group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Low risk of surface water flooding identified along road frontage to Court Farm Lane. Land Drainage Engineers advise that Court Farm Lane conveys flood flows during heavy storms. No other flooding events in SFRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Not identified on the ALC map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Adj bus stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes, 2 out of 5. Shop - 312m, Hall - adj site, Emp Opp. - 1000m, School - not in village, Doctors - not in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes would increase stock based on 43 units @30 dph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan. SAP response - if housing is increased in Beckford gas would be needed in the village and sewerage would need upgrading. Any additional housing, even outside the conservation area, needs to be in keeping with the style of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Adjacent the Conservation Area and therefore any proposal would need to be taken into account. Views towards Beckford Hall needs to be respected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This is a new site submitted to the SHLAA and has had positive feedback from the Panel. Potentially could accommodate 10 units on the site, provided e.g. Highway concerns with regards to hedgerow and tree removal and acceptable design standards are met. Linear development is considered most appropriate and would replicate building form on Main Street and Back Lane. The site is also located outside the flood prone area of Beckford. However, site is approx 1m above the adjoining roads and could have harmful impact on the adjoining Conservation area and its constituent listed buildings and Ancient Monuments. The site was subject to the significant change consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bretforton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>15-02 - ruled out Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, i.e. through SHLAA.</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>N (near to conservation area but residential use may be more appropriate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>Some less and intermediate risk (particularly in north and eastern parts of the site).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>9 dwellings at 30dph less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
<td>The site lies closer to the centre of the village which (if sensitively designed) would enhance the village centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Could be a suitable site but currently used as a garage - an employment site and a useful community facility. Availability unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>15-05 - ruled out incorrectly as PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Single owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>The site is washed over by medium flood risk zone according to EA but no recorded local history of flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to the required standards being met in order to provide a safe access off Station Road (C2047), access to serve the site would be accepted from this road. Visibility splays in either direction of 2.4m x 43m will be a minimum requirement. Some footway improvement works will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y (adjacent to residential areas and an allocated site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Any development would need to incorporate Sustainable drainage techniques and undertake a flood risk assessment before development could be approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Currently crops so likely to be reasonably good agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y 350m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>750m shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>48 dwellings just over 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Suitable site with safe access to highway and central to facilities. No impact on Conservation Area. Current application for 48 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Criteria</td>
<td>Other Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>15-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA)</td>
<td>Available now, landowner supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Zone 1 and small part zone 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Main Street, B4035, is a heavily trafficked road with a high percentage of HGV's, for this reason there can be no compromise on design standards. The site frontage is somewhat limited as consequently visibility to the right may be restricted by a mature laurel hedge which appears to be third party ownership. Before this site is allocated we need to be assured that access is achievable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y (adjacent to Public open space and residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Part of the site is protected open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Part protected open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Road frontage intermediate risk of surface water flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>555m shop, 450m to school,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>8 dwellings at 30 dph less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Awkward site narrow and set adjacent to open space and opposite listed buildings partly within the Conservation Area. Access and setting is of concern could affect the setting of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Awkward site with Highway issues there are preferable sites.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>15-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, i.e. through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Available now/ landowner supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Floodzone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Clayfield Road is a single width road which without widening is considered unsuitable to serve any development. If it were possible to widened the road then some development potential on this site could be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y Residential and open countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>550m to bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Just over 1km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>24 dwellings at 30 dph less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>This site extends the village westward and is difficult to access due to narrow road and established hedge row.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Highways are not supportive, the village would be extended westward away from the facilities and there are preferable sites in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>15-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Floods to south of site development would need to be contained to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards, access to Station Road will be acceptable. Individual accesses directly on to public highway also acceptable. The provision of a new footway across site frontage required in order to provide pedestrian connectivity to Coldicott Lane and village centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Y (in conservation area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Listed Building adjacent to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site/ Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Some less risk in the north of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low-medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Not more than 10% if only use part of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>There may be an impact on setting of Listed Building and Conservation Area would need to be a consideration in design. Development would need to be set near to road to avoid the floodplain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>There are better sites in the village. This site was proposed in Preferred options for front of site development but removed due to flooding and impact on setting of Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Croptorne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>25-01</td>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site proposed at Significant changes, however former Preferred Option with reduced boundaries considered more appropriate and in keeping with street scene. Concern over access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (i.e. through SHLAA), Land owner supportive promoted at Preferred Options</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Outside flood plain</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes is more than 450m away</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access from Blacksmith Lane subject to meeting current design standards would be acceptable. I would however like to see if possible rear access being provided to the existing residential properties fronting Blacksmith Lane so as to be able to remove the existing on street car parking which would hinder visibility from any new access.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT (bus stop)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
<td>(bus stop) is within 400m of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some surface water issues identified at north of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Residential and open countryside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Public right of way at access point of site and 2 paths through site</td>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Parish Plan - Support for a shop/cafe in the village. Recognise need for housing / affordable housing but as long as appropriate to local need and in keeping with character of Croptorne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Site could be development without affecting character, although back land development and would need to potentially knock down property for access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>is within 400m of the site. Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Some surface water issues identified at north of site.</td>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>300m to bus stop</td>
<td><strong>Max 6 dwellings well under 10%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>School is 400 metres away and the bus stop is 300 metres</td>
<td>Parish Plan - Support for a shop/cafe in the village. Recognise need for housing / affordable housing but as long as appropriate to local need and in keeping with character of Croptorne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site could be development without affecting character, although back land development and would need to potentially knock down property for access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Outside flood plain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes is more than 450m away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design providing a safe junction arrangement with Lower Croft, access from Middle Lane could be considered. There is a lack of footway links between the site and Main Street, therefore additional traffic on Middle Lane may cause a traffic problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y - adj residential, although would need to be sensitive in design terms to the CA adj.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site governed by Nature Reserve?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Not identified as an issue on SFRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low/medium - Phase 1 with application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y - 400m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>1 / 5. School - 600m, VH - 2km, Shop - not in village, Employment Opp - 1.7 km, Doctors - not in village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>N - 22/15 units @20/30 dph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Parish Plan - Support for a shop/cafe in the village. Recognise need for housing / affordable housing but as long as appropriate to local need and in keeping with character of Cropthorne. SAP Responses - The settlement boundary should be extended to include this land as a natural extension of the village, convenient for services and facilities and to contribute towards the County's proposed Rural Housing Allocation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>No but Nature reserve adj.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

This site should not be considered for future development as part of the site, adjacent access track on the frontage of Middle Lane is built out by large detached property. The majority of the site is located to the rear of existing properties on Middle Lane and considered development of this site would be out of keeping with the existing development form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>25-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, i.e. through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Land owner supportive and land available now:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to complying with current design standards access from Middle Lane would considered be acceptable. A PROW runs along the western boundary of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y Residential and agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N, although PROW across part off site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s),</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Not identified as an issue on SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>N 800m to bus stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>700m to village hall and school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Land owner proposed for 10 dwellings under 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Parish Plan - Support for a shop/cafe in the village. Recognise need for housing / affordable housing but as long as appropriate to local need and in keeping with character of Cropthorne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>This site cuts into this open wedge of land, detracting from the contribution that it makes to the character of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site cuts into this open wedge of land, detracting from the contribution that it makes to the character of the village. Not suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>25-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.</strong></td>
<td>Ownership known. Available now part of site granted planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Part of this was recently granted planning consent for social housing served off Field Barn Lane by means of a single access point. The approval of this access will precluded any further accesses complying with current design standards, therefore it is suggested that should it be considered appropriate to allocate the whole of the site then a redesign to incorporate the social housing site should be undertaken or the remainder of the site should be restricted to frontage development only. Some improvements to provide pedestrian linkage to the village centre will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>TBC BY GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - adj residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No - outside the LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>TBC BY GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>No events identified in the SFRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No up to date survey available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>No - 500m to bus stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>3/s School - 617m, VH - 562m, Shop - not in village, Employment Opp - 445m, Doctors - not in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>No - recommend 6 dwellings under 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Parish Plan - Support for a shop/cafe in the village. Recognise need for housing / affordable housing but as long as appropriate to local need and in keeping with character of Cropthorne. SAP Responses - None recorded for this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
<td>No should not materially affect the character of the village. The site is outside the CA of Cropthorne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site is considered suitable for appropriate development in the future with a reduced site area. The site is adjacent residential and frontage development would not look out of keeping on this site. Recommend 6 dwellings alongside existing planning permission hence reduced site area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>31-02 (Site now has planning permission - SWDP 24/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Single ownership / available within 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Existing access points from Stonebow Road will require improvements in order to meet current design standards. Footway across site frontage required to provide safe crossing points to opposite footway. Frontage development taking direct access from Stonebow Road would be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>North east corner of site part of wider ecological network connecting settlement to wider landscape; pond?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Small amount of less risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low-medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site now deleted from SWDP as planning permission has been granted for affordable housing. Site now built-out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>31-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Single ownership / Available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Existing access points from Stonebow Road will require improvements in order to meet current design standards. Footway across site frontage required to provide safe crossing points to opposite footway. Frontage development taking direct access from Stonebow Road would be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Check with Green Infrastructure Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Check with Green Infrastructure Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Based on the SFRA no surface water flooding risk on site. However the site is adjacent intermediate and less risk to the south east boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No grading identified on the post 1988 ALC classification map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y (Hal 730m, Sib 737m, PO 393m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>The site is to the rear of 31-02 which is currently being developed. Therefore the site can no longer be satisfactorily accessed. In design terms the development of this site would have only made sense in conjunction with 31-02.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site should not be allocated for the reasons highlighted above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference: 31.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Single ownership / Available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period. (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Check with Green Infrastructure Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Check with Green Infrastructure Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Check with Green Infrastructure Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>Based on the SFRA no surface water flooding risk is identified on this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No grading identified on the post 1988 ALC classification map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td>Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Y (Hall 75m, Sch 157m, PO 540m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Less than 10% based on the 50 units proposed in the SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td>Most of Drakes Broughton is located to the north of the B4084 but this is balanced by the good accessibility of most of the local facilities and does not encroach into the wider countryside as it is framed by woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Proposed allocation in the SWDP as it is considered to have greater planning merit than the available sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>31-09: R/O: Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Landowner unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Limited access, possibly through Beach Avenue, Third Party ownership issues. Possibly maximum of 6 units due to access constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Limited access, possibly through Beach Avenue, Third Party ownership issues. Possibly maximum of 6 units due to access constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact in ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Check with Green Infrastructure Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Check with Green Infrastructure Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Most of the site covered by Intermediate with some less risk surrounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>The site abuts the village, the front of the site is included within the development boundary. Development is unlikely to affect the character of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Because the site is very narrow, it would only be a logical allocation if it were combined with 31-11. Also, there is no confirmed access point onto Stonebow Road. The site could be suitable for development providing the surface water flooding issues are addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>31-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Existing access point from Stonebow Road will require improvements in order to meet current design standards. Alternatively, this access could be closed and a new one provided across site frontage, there is insufficient site frontage for two access points so development potential limited. Footway across site frontage required to link with existing footway to south of site. Speed restriction will require to be extended at developers expense to railway line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Gap.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it .</strong></td>
<td>Large part of site covered by intermediate and ‘less risk’ surface water flooding (probably caused by drains under the railway embankment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>More than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>The railway embankment provides reasonable containments for the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>The Highway Authority are not convinced that a satisfactory access can be delivered. The site is not as accessible overall to local services as the proposed allocation and is subject to drainage and sewage issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>31-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td>Available now and single ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period. (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC. Comments for site 31-11. Existing access point from Stonebow Road will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>require improvements in order to meet current design standards. Alternatively,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this access could be closed and a new one provided across site frontage,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is insufficient site frontage for two access points so development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential limited. Footway across site frontage required to link with existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>footway to south of site. Speed restriction will require to be extended at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developers expense to railway line.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>TBC with green infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>TBC with green infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Check with Green Infrastructure Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Check with Green Infrastructure Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>The site has intermediate and less surface water flooding risk identified on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td>To confirm with Contamination Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes. Hall: 1071m, School: 1182m, Post Office: 556m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no stats distance.</td>
<td>N - 490m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td>Would be an unusual shaped intrusion into the countryside unless developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>together with 31-09 and 31-11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Not suitable for an allocation as 31-09 and 31-11 have now been removed from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>Eckington 33-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Category 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA),</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Roman Drive is a road which is not yet adopted as a public highway, but is the subject of a Section 38 agreement for it to be adopted by us at sometime in the future. Subject to development not adversely affecting the current adoption process the alignment and road widths are considered appropriate to serve further development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise International or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Residential to south and east, recreation ground to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unlikely given greenfield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Bus stop within 250m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. Village centre 200m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>20 houses at 30dph (site size 0.8ha).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Parish Plan adopted in 2004 identifies the delivery of affordable housing, community building in the form of a recreation centre identified as a high priority in the action plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>This site has a great deal of planning merit and could be incorporated as an addition to the rural exception site. Not visually prominent, close proximity to recreation facilities, if pedestrian access can be secured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This is a good site for approximately 20 dwellings. Well-screened but would need to leave a buffer to railway line although the line is embanked at this point so noise may not be a significant issue. Access via Roman Meadow onto Pershore Road via rural exception site. Allocated in the SWDP for 20 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Available now / single ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Subject to junction design compiling with design standards access from Dilmore Lane will be acceptable. Off site improvements to Dilmore Lane/A38 junction may be required dependant upon level of development. If adjacent Tappenhall Farm site is promoted also access to this site may be adversely affected, therefore if both are to be brought forward access requirements identified will require review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Yes, 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Yes, Phase 1 survey required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes 350m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>No 1 Km from the shop, hall and school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No Parish Plan produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
<td>The scale of the site is such that it would not have a significant impact on the character. The site is quite prominent in the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Site is now proposed to be deleted in the Significant Changes. Now confirmed on the grounds that the land is of higher agricultural value than 61-14 and two accesses off Dilmore Lane would be problematic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>61-14 - Proposed modification to increase size of site in SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (i.e. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available within 5 years / Single ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Station Road / A38 junction is a potential showstopper as is access to the site for Station Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes agriculture / residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes but coalescence issue with Lower Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Less and intermediate surface water run off risk - travelling the site SW - NE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Yes, Phase 1 survey required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes 350m (assumes access is off Dilmore Lane) As for 61-06 unless there is pedestrian access from Station Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes, 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>A 65% increase in households is excessive. With a population of over 4,400 Fernhill Heath would resemble more a town than a village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Proposed site to be extended to provide 350 dwellings amid a new primary school in Significant Changes document. However, this is now considered to be desirable rather than essential, so the number of dwellings has now been reduced to 120.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>38-06 - Land off Broadway Lane. Site currently ruled out as too small but likely to be ruled back in as brownfield unsightly site - duplicated with 38-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA). Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? Available now Flood Zone 1 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to the required standards being met in order to provide a safe access off Broadway Lane, access to serve the site would be accepted from this road. Visibility splays in either direction of 2.4m x 43m will be a minimum requirement. In view of the size of site and frontage to Field Barn Lane development lands itself to individual properties taking direct access onto the road, this is something which we would not oppose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes adj residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedges.</td>
<td>TBC GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Less risk surface water flooding risk identified by the SFRA to the north of the site..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date survey available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>No - 700m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>2 out of 5. School - 717m, Village Hall - 570m, Employment Opportunity - over 1 km.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No, 0.16 = 5 @30 dph - no would not increase housing stock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Parish Plan - The majority of responses (approx.50% of respondents) indicated that affordable housing and houses for young families were the most important housing need. This followed by (40%) wanting small homes and bungalows in the village. Suggestion that residents would support infill rather than spread of development. Would welcome a village shop.SAP response: No SAP response for this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>The site is adjacent a two car width road, a flat, brownfied site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **OTHER CRITERIA**       |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Summary | The site is outside the Conservation Area, adjacent the development boundary of Fladbury and could be considered for small scale development adjacent the development boundary. The site is currently an unsightly brownfield site and developing this would be an improvement to the existing use. Consider frontage development of approximately 7 dwellings. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>SHLAA site reference: 39-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Direct access from Radford Road or Bishampton Road. Visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m required in both directions for either. Part frontage development to Bishampton Road possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y (though edge of village so would need to consider landscape etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>N/low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Adjacent to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>150m to school and shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Propose 12 dwellings and village green just over 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Yes could provide a community facility - public open space which the village is lacking in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Site could be developed sensitively set back around a village green.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site is the most suitable in the village. The site is closer to the centre of the village is flat and could be developed to provide a village green and a focal point for the village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SHLAA site reference
39-04 (Ruled out) PPG17 Impact on setting of Church raised ground.

### Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary
2

### Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g through SHLAA).
Unknown

### Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.
Flood Zone 1

### Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?
No pipeline

### The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.
Subject to complying with current design standards a single point of access from Radford Road central to the site frontage would be considered acceptable to serve this development site.

### Sewerage and Water supply adequate?
No in principle objection from Severn Trent

### Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?
N

### The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.
Y Residential and church,

### Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.
N

### There is no detrimental impact on Green Infrastructure Network?
N

### There is not significant net loss of protected open space?
N

### There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?
N

### There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s). List building adjoining
Adjacent to Church

### There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.
N

### There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.
N

### There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.
N

### There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.
N

### There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.
N

### There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.
N established hedgerow to road frontage

### The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.

### Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.
No information

### Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.
No information

### Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.
Y 100m

### Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?
150m to school and shop.

### Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?
Could accommodate 10 dwellings -10%

### Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.
This site is not big enough to incorporate open space.

### The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement
Site raised so may potentially be visually intrusive in views from the west/south-west. Possible loss of established hedging to road frontage for access – would be detrimental to the character of the lane at the entrance to the village. Consider impact on setting of adjacent church – affect on landscape character.

### Site ruled in or out of SWDP
Out

### Summary
Not preferable due to impact on church and character of village. There are better sites in the village.

---

### MAJOR CRITERIA

### OTHER CRITERIA

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>39-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Put forward by Robert Jolly - available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Single access point from Bishamton Road, could possibly access 39-03. Visibility Splays of 2.4m x 33m required in both directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Listed building a few doors away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>This would be back land development, there are a few examples of this in the village but it would not enhance or contribute to the existing street scene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site is behind the existing development and would not add to the existing street scene. There is a more preferable site in the centre of the village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No/Other/With distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No/Other/With distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harvington</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationaly or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SHLAA site reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>46-11- R/O: Availability Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary**

| 2 |

**Landowners have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners have made representations to the SWDP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.**

| 1 |

**Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**

| Yes |

**The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**

**Preferably access should be taken from Crest Hill, but as the name implies the vertical alignment of the road may severely restrict access standards being met and therefore access off this road must be severely questioned. Due to the junction between Crest Hill and B4039 and the opposite junction between B4039 and Anchor Lane, access from the B4039 will not be permissible. It is strongly advised that if this site is to be allocated further investigation is required to establish whether or not a suitable access arrangement can be achieved.**

**Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**

| No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water |

**Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**

| No |

**Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**

| No |

**The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.**

| Yes. Residential adjacent on opposite side of road. |

**There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**

| N |

**There is not significant net loss of protected open space?**

| N |

**There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**

| N |

**There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?**

| N |

**There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**

| N |

**There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**

| TBC |

**There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**

| N |

**There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**

| N |

**There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**

| No |

**There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedge/grow.**

| Hedge |

**The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.**

| No surface Water flooding |

**Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**

| Predicted grade 5. |

**Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.**

| TBC |

**Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.**

| Yes- 220m |

**School: 560m, Hall: 500m, Shop: 700m, Employment.**

**Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?**

| Site in itself is 2.3ha x 30dph=69. Developing whole of site would not take development above 10% threshold. However- we are not intending to allocate all of this site. |

**Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.**

| Could assist in delivering additional open space or allotments. These are issues that have been identified in the Parish Plan & VDS as being in need of additional supply or improvement to current provision. |

**The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement**

| By advocating frontage development, this should not materially affect the charcter of the settlement as there are frontage properties adjacent this site. |

**Site ruled in or out of SWDP**

| Out |

**Summary**

<p>| Landscape Officer objects to this site. Site highly visible on sloping land, particularly in views from Cleeve Hill to the east. Encroachment into open countryside. Impact on views towards Harvington church. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>46-12: R/O: Duplicated with 46-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Need to check availability timeframe - Landowner is clearly supportive of the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Outside flood plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Site frontage to Crest Hill considered too narrow to form access to adoptable standards. Therefore site should be developed in conjunction with 46-3 of be limited to direct access to individual properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Adj residential and footpath around the north of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>BAP within 25 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Not identified as risk by SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y - adj the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>275: School - 450m, VH - 1km, Shop - 580m, Doctors - Not in village, Employment Opp - not in village. N - 5/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Parish Plan (Plan still to be approved) No significant development - perhaps individual homes or very small scale development. Sheltered or residential care home would be welcomed in the village. SAP Responses - Development towards Norton/Evesham along the main roads should be avoided, small developments in keeping with village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Yes would affect the character of area as large site on steeply sloping hill. Agent indicated access could either be from adj Rectory at Crest Hill or frontage at the jct of Crest Hill with the bypass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site is too small for a housing allocation in the SWDP. However, by amending the development boundary currently set out in the Wychavon Local Plan, 2 to 3 houses could come forward as windfall development. Access could either be taken as direct access for individual properties off Crest Hill or via private access track off Station Road. SWDP: Amend development boundary to allow for windfall development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>46-20- Land adjacent to Crest Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>Available now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.</strong></td>
<td>Outside flood plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards access from Crest Hill will be acceptable. Direct access to individual properties fronting Crest Hill will also be acceptable. The provision of a footway across the site frontage linking to existing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Adj residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Consider strong hedgerow connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>South site adj CA - would need to be sympathetic in design terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>BAP within 25 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>Not identified as risk by SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Low - Phase 1 with application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Y - 36m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>2 / 5. School - 450m, VH - 1km, Shop - 580km, Doctors - Not in village, Employment Opp - not in village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>N - 19/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Parish Plan - (Plan still to be approved) No significant development - perhaps individual homes or very small scale development. Sheltered or residential care home would be welcomed in the village. SAP Responses - Development towards Norton/Evesham along the main roads should be avoided, small developments in keeping with village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
<td>No should not affect character of area, slightly undulating site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site could be considered for future development, however suitable for small scale development - frontage development. Highway comments supportive of access off Crest Hill subject to junction design complying with design standards. Recommend 5 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

364
## Overbury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site was consulted upon in the SWDP Preferred Options. Highways had objected to the original access to the site off School Lane as it is a Private Road over which a public right of way runs, and if part of it is single carriageway width and has no recognised turning facility, albeit the open field to the north of Nine Acres Cottage was witnessed as being used for this purpose. Visibility at the junction of School Lane and C2005 is severely restricted by Cotswold stone walls on either side of the entrance. For these reasons the development of any site off School Lane is considered inappropriate on grounds of highway safety. It was also noted at the time of the site School Lane was being used for the purpose of picking up of children from the adjacent school. Since then the new access submitted during the consultation has now been assessed by Highways who are still unhappy with the proposal. This site has been considered unsuitable for development.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not applicable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not applicable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>In</strong></td>
<td><strong>In</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

- Site was consulted upon in the SWDP Preferred Options. Highways had objected to the original access to the site off School Lane as it is a Private Road over which a public right of way runs, and if part of it is single carriageway width and has no recognised turning facility, albeit the open field to the north of Nine Acres Cottage was witnessed as being used for this purpose. Visibility at the junction of School Lane and C2005 is severely restricted by Cotswold stone walls on either side of the entrance. For these reasons the development of any site off School Lane is considered inappropriate on grounds of highway safety. It was also noted at the time of the site School Lane was being used for the purpose of picking up of children from the adjacent school. Since then the new access submitted during the consultation has now been assessed by Highways who are still unhappy with the proposal (see comments in Highways box). Since then Overbury estates have made a rep to demonstrate that a suitable access can be achieved. Therefore allocate site for 8 houses. |
### MAJOR CRITERIA

| Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary | 2 |
| Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA) | Yes - available now |
| Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone. | 1 |
| Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | Yes |
| The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. | Consideration should be given to combining this site with 72-17 as junction spacing from classified road will prohibit two access points. Direct access to individual properties will be acceptable subject to providing adequate turning facilities. |
| Sewerage and Water supply adequate? | No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water |
| Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. | No |
| Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? | No |
| The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. | Yes - residential adjoining to south, otherwise open countryside, but electricity pylons 50m away |

### OTHER CRITERIA

| There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | TBC |
| There is not significant net loss of protected open space? | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s). | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. | TBC |
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. | TBC |
| Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. | No - grade 3 land |
| Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. | Low risk - phase 1 with application |
| Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance. | Yes - 100m |
| Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? | School 520m, village hall 660m, employment opportunities 1.2km. No doctors surgery or shop. |
| Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? | 13 |
| Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan. | No parish plan or VDS. SAP responses - 1 for - could form modest extension to village, 0 against. |
| The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement. | No - limited views in and out of site, feels contained. Bungalows to south. |

### Summary

The site is at the periphery of the village but is within 800m of the village facilities and 100m of a bus stop. The gently sloping site is well contained with no long distance views into and out of the site, currently used for horses. Hedging to road boundary. Is south of 72-17. Could have road frontage or single access development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>72-11</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood Zone.</td>
<td>Yes - available in 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - agricultural land to north and west, office in barn conversion to south and residential opposite to east beyond protected open space. Footpaths along southern and northern boundaries of site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? TBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s). No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. TBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Intermediate risk top north west corner - approx 10% of site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No - grade 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - immediately opposite site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>school 180m, village hall 330m, pub 65m, employment 860m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? 60, but possibly only frontage development?</td>
<td>No - parish plan or VDS. No SAP responses specific to the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan or VDS. No SAP responses specific to the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Relatively flat site, long distance views to countryside beyond. Impact of development potentially quite high, but could be reduced if set behind grassed and treed strip as is characteristic of parts of village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP In (part of site)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relatively flat site, long distance views to and from countryside beyond. Impact of development potentially quite high, but could be reduced if set behind grassed and treed strip as is characteristic of parts of village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>72-17 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. Consideration should be given to combining this site with 72-10 as junction spacing from classified road will prohibit two access points. Direct access to individual properties will be acceptable subject to providing adequate turning facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/ surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - agricultural land to north, east and to west on other side of road, residential to south</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>intermediate risk alongside brook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>no - grade 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>low risk - phase 1 with application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - 120m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 16%?</strong></td>
<td>27 - 8.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No Parish Plan or VDS. SAP comments - 1 for - could form modest extension to village. 0 - against</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>No - limited views in and out of site, feels contained. Bungalows to south.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled In or out of SWDP.</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The site is at the periphery of the village but is within 800m of the village facilities and 120m of a bus stop. The gently sloping site is well contained with no long distance views into and out of the site, currently used for horses. Hedging to road boundary. Could not be developed in isolation from 72-10. Could have road frontage or single access development, 7 possible additional access from The Green for a few dwellings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>72-19 - land to the rear of Ashfurlong, Main St 2.84ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>The site has very little frontage to Main Street which will prevent the formation of an access to serve the whole site identified. Subject to complying with design standards a private driveway arrangement may be possible which will limit numbers to a maximum of 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - residential to east. Site is former nursery with agricultural buildings on it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>No known flooding issues at the site. However overland flows do come across from the highway towards the properties on the eastern boundary of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - bus stop within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes - school, hall and pub all within 800m, employment approx 1 km.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No Parish Plan or VOS. Subject to significant change consultation. Main concern overall number proposed for Pinvin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>No - limited amount of development that would be seen in context of existing housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP.</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>The site has a central position within the village and is relatively close to its services and facilities. The site could only accommodate a maximum of 6 dwellings due to the restricted width of the access, which would form a private drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-20 - Polestar Premises, Abbey View Road, 5.86 ha</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>The site is a former employment site and its loss as such is not supported by officers. The Economic Development Team are keen to retain the site for employment to maintain a portfolio of sites and it is understood that there is some interest in the market for such.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Residential on road frontage, A44 to north, and employment and railway to south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td>Residential on road frontage, A44 to north, and employment and railway to south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>Residential on road frontage, A44 to north, and employment and railway to south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Residential on road frontage, A44 to north, and employment and railway to south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no no adverse impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no no adverse impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no no adverse impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no no adverse impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no no adverse impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no no adverse impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no no adverse impact on ancient hedgeow.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No known flooding issues</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be some contamination as previously in employment use - would require appropriate land surveys</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - school and village hall approx 600m. Yes doctors surgery within Pinvin - nearest at Pershore hospital - approx 1.5 km away.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parish plan or vds</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - site currently in employment use and its redevelopment for housing would change the character of the area.</td>
<td>Yes - both bus and train within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference: 72-21 - Land off Main St 0.8ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, Static Flood zone.</td>
<td>Yes, 165m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No direct access will be permitted to the A44 Allens Hill / Abbey View Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Access may be possible from B4082 at northern end of site, subject to current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>design standards being complied with, Pinvin cross roads is a junction which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>has been identified as being subject to congestion at peak periods,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>without future development. The potential to develop a site in close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proximity to this junction will require the promoter to fully assess the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impact on this junction and mitigate against any detrimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affects traffic generation from the new development will have on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No, Residential to the north, A44 to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td>Yes - the site is currently a strategic gap in the Wychavon District Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Yes - the site is considered to be an important gap between the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to the south of A44 and the main village of Pinvin. The gap ensures that the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>village proper is distinct from the A44 whereas development here would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change its character so that it became a village on the A44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td>No known flooding issues at the site. However the highway does flood at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>main crossroads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Yes - currently grazing land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if</td>
<td>Yes - buss top within 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td>Yes - school and hall within 800m. Pub slightly further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td>No - 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting / identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No parish plan or vds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Yes - the site is considered to be an important gap between the development to the south of A44 and the main village of Pinvin. The gap ensures that the village proper is distinct from the A44 whereas development here would change its character so that it became a village on the A44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered to be an important gap between the development to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>south of A44 and the main village of Pinvin. The gap ensures that the village proper is distinct from the A44 whereas development here would change its character so that it became a village on the A44. The field should therefore remain undeveloped.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sedgeberrow</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>76.04 - R/O: Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Floodzone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Not assessed by Highways Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>Not assessed by GI Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/ surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Adjacent residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>Not assessed by GI Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)?</strong></td>
<td>LB AT Hall Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/ landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>Not assessed by GI Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>The site is covered by ‘more and intermediate risk’ as identified by the SFRA. Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Y - 60 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>3 / 5. School and Village Hall - 500m. Shop - 200m, Employment and Doctors - not in village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>No at 0.75ha = 19 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Parish Plan - Village Hall currently occupied in the School however PP identifies that facilities could be improved as underused. Suggestion that new Village Hall could be beneficial. Identiﬁes a need for a sports ﬁeld and tennis court in the village. 63% of respondents stated affordable starter homes were needed in the village. 82% of respondents highlighted the need to put pressure on authorities to reduce the flooding issues in particular the need to extend the floodplain of the River Isbourne. SAP responses - Development should incorporate new public open space. Support for improvements in sports facilities / play area. Shop and pub are vital community facilities in a village and should be supported. Concern over the drainage and flooding in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>The site should not be considered for future development as the site is adj high risk flood plain which could increase SW run off, also site on bend which may not be supported by highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>76-06 land behind Main Street - 12 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No known flooding issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>I note that the applicant has allegedly purchased a property in order to gain access. When responding to Denise it was not clear that the developer had brought the whole property as his plans indicated the existing property was to be retained, as a consequence I agreed to reducing our standards slightly to accommodate what had been submitted. Had I at the time known the developer owned the whole of the property I would not have agreed to this relaxation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No Objections raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Church, shop, park within walking distance - school 270m along road, 400m to shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>90m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Parish Plan - Village Hall currently occupied in the School however PP identifies that facilities could be improved as underused. Suggestion that new Village Hall could be beneficial. Identifies a need for a sports field and tennis court in the village. 63% of respondents stated affordable starter homes were needed in the village. 82% of respondents highlighted the need to put pressure on authorities to reduce the flooding issues in particular the need to extend the floodplain of the River Isbourne. SAP responses - Development should incorporate new public open space. Support for improvements in sports facilities / play area. Shop and pub are vital community facilities in a village and should be supported. Concern over the drainage and flooding in the village. Concern over parked cars and traffic on Main Street, issue with access?.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>No- it is not considered that the development of this site would detrimentally affect the character of the settlement as development lines exists either side of this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

- Site measures 0.83 ha which at maximum capacity could support 23 dwellings at 30 dwellings per hectare. However it is suggested that 12 dwellings would be more suitable, when considering neighbouring densities. Suggest allocation for 12 dwellings.
Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary

2

Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).

Avail 5 years

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?

N

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.

Access to site would be via a public right of way over which increase traffic flows would be resisted, therefore site not considered appropriate for development. Notwithstanding this visibility at the junction with Main Street is restricted.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate?

No in principle objections from Severn Trent

Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.

N

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?

N

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.

Surrounding gardens of residential units, adj TPO and impact on church and grounds.

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?

N - footpath on southern boundary. Potential for hedgerow enhancement.

There is no significant net loss of protected open space?

N

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?

N

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).

Y - St Mary's Church

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

N

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.

Needs to be considered - BAP within 25 m.

There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.

Y

There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.

N

There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.

No

The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.

No events identified on SFRA

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.

Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.

Low - Phase 1 with application

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.

Y - 50 m

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?

3 / 5. School and Village Hall - 560m, Shop - 330m, Employment and Doctors - not in village.

Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?

N - 23/15

Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.

Parish Plan - Village Hall currently occupied in the School however PP identifies that facilities could be improved as underused. Suggestion that new Village Hall could be beneficial. Identifies a need for a sports field and tennis court in the village. 63% of respondents stated affordable starter homes were needed in the village. 82% of respondents highlighted the need to put pressure on authorities to reduce the flooding issues in particular the need to extend the floodplain of the River Isbourne. SAP responses - Development should incorporate new public open space. Support for improvements in sports facilities / play area. Shop and pub are vital community facilities in a village and should be supported. Concern over the drainage and flooding in the village. Good access but adj Church.

The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement

Yes - based on highway comments. Surrounding gardens of residential units, adj TPO and impact on church and grounds.

Site ruled in or out of SWDP

Out

Summary

Site is not considered for future development as Highways not supportive. Concerns over the visibility of the site onto Main Street and access is via public right of way and therefore increase traffic flow along this path should be resisted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>76-11: R/O: Avail unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA)</td>
<td>Availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Y - 405m from esso buffer zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Not been assessed by Highways team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Not assessed by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Adjacent residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Not assessed by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Identified in the SFRA as less risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y - 50 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>3 / 5. School and Village Hall - 560m, Shop - 330m, Employment and Doctors - not in village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No - 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Parish Plan - Village Hall currently occupied in the School however PP identifies that facilities could be improved as underused. Suggestion that new Village Hall could be beneficial. Identifies a need for a sports field and tennis court in the village. 63% of respondents stated affordable starter homes were needed in the village. 82% of respondents highlighted the need to put pressure on authorities to reduce the flooding issues in particular the need to extend the floodplain of the River Isbourne. SAP responses - Development should incorporate new public open space. Support for improvements in sports facilities / play area. Shop and pub are vital community facilities in a village and should be supported. Concern over the drainage and flooding in the village. Good access but adj Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>Site has not been assessed by the Highways Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The site would mean knocking down orchard trees and is therefore not suitable for development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

**MAJOR CRITERIA**

- The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.
  
  Access to site would be via a public right of way over which increase traffic flows would be resisted, therefore site not considered appropriate for development. Notwithstanding this viability at the junction with Main Street is restricted.

- Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.
  
  N

- The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.
  
  Y - Adj residential.

- There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?
  
  N - footpath eastern boundary

- There is no detrimental impact on National Heritage sites (s)
  
  N

- There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.
  
  N

- There is no detrimental impact on Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.
  
  N

- There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.
  
  N

- There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.
  
  N

- There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.
  
  Mature garden trees; hedges

- The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.
  
  No events identified on SFRA

- Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.
  
  Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.

- Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.
  
  Low - Phase 1 with application

- Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.
  
  Y - 240m

- Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?
  
  3 / 5. Shop -450m, School and Village Hall -130m, Employment and Doctors - not in village.

- Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?
  
  N - 20/13

- Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.

  Parish Hall - Village Hall currently occupied in the School however PP identifies that facilities could be improved as underused. Suggestion that new Village Hall could be beneficial. Identifies a need for a sports field and tennis court in the village. 63% of respondents stated affordable starter homes were needed in the village. 82% of respondents highlighted the need to put pressure on authorities to reduce the flooding issues in particular the need to extend the floodplain of the River Isbourne. SAP responses - Development should incorporate new public open space. Support for improvements in sports facilities / play area. Shop and pub are vital community facilities in a village and should be supported. Concern over the drainage and flooding in the village.

- The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement

  Yes - based on Highway comments.

- Site ruled in or out of SWDP

  Out

- Summary

  Site is not considered for future development as Highways not supportive. Concerns over the visibility of the site onto Main Street and access via public right of way and therefore increase traffic flow along this path should be resisted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>76-19: Land off Winchcombe Road - 8 units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, i.e. through SHLAA</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No known flooding issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The site fronts the B4078 on the edge of the village where a speed limit of 30mph commences at the entry to the village. Traffic speeds passed the site frontage were observed to exceed the speed limit in both directions. As the site is also on the inside of a bend the formation of any junction along this section of road is not considered to be a proposal which can be supported in terms of road safety without a lot of further design work being undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>255m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Church, shop, park within walking distance - school 1200m along road 950m using footpath, 490m to shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Parish Plan - Village Hall currently occupied in the School however PP identifies that facilities could be improved as underused. Suggestion that new Village Hall could be beneficial. Identifies a need for a sports field and tennis court in the village. 63% of respondents stated affordable starter homes were needed in the village. 82% of respondents highlighted the need to put pressure on authorities to reduce the flooding issues in particular the need to extend the floodplain of the River Isbourne. SAP responses - Development should incorporate new public open space. Support for improvements in sports facilities / play area. Shop and pub are vital community facilities in a village and should be supported. Concern over the drainage and flooding in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>No. If site were sympathetically developed for frontage development only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>1.24 ha - could support 37 dwellings using density calculator but envisage frontage only for 8 units. SWDP: Allocation for 8 dwellings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>78-04 (site previously ruled out as availability unknown).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>Yes - agent representing landowner has submitted representations to the SWDP, indicating that the land is now available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to suitable access arrangements being agreed, access to this site will be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - adjacent residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgesrow.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Small area of surface water flooding (strip) on west of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Predictive land quality map - grade 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>120m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Y - Shop - 672m, Employment - 1.3km, Doctors - Scout Hut, 950m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No. 0.68 x 30dph = 20. However, proposing 6 new dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan. SAP responses. Assignments and open space provision should be incorporated into any development, flat and accessible site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>No. By allowing frontage development, this would replicate the frontage development either side of the site and on the opposite side of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Although the density multiplier would equate to 20 dwellings, at 30 dwellings per hectare, suggest the development of 6 dwellings would be more appropriate for frontage development only. Significant Change: Allocate for 6 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SHLAA site reference

- 78-06: Land off Station Road & Long Hyde Road

### Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary

- Available for 5 years

### Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.

- No

### Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?

- No

### The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.

- Subject to junction design complying with design standards access to Long Hyde Road could be acceptable. This will be subject to junction spacing with St Michaels Close and visibility requirements. Access to Station Road will also be acceptable but frontage development with direct access could be resisted. A possible link between Station Road and Long Hyde Road could be provided which may relieve congestion in village centre. A requirement of the development will be to provide new and improved footways linking the village with Blackminster School.

### Sewerage and Water supply adequate?

- No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

### Is the site in Green Belt?

- No

### The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.

- Y - adj residential

### There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?

- Old hedges; boundary trees; scrub at southern tip

### There is no significant net loss of protected open space?

- N

### There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?

- N

### There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?

- N

### There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

- N

### There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site/Local Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.

- Landscape Officer’s comments to SWDP PO consultation: Elevated and sloping site – visually dominant in distant/middle-distant views. Mature trees on adjacent site (Orchard House) are prominent landscape feature. Development would affect setting of these trees and ‘urbanise’ entrance to village. May be scope for some small-scale development along Station Road frontage at lower level.

### There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.

- TPO adj site

### There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.

- N

### There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.

- N

### There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.

- Old hedges

### The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.

- Not identified as risk by SFRA.

### Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.

- Approx 85m

### Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.

- Y - School - 600m, Shop - 600m, Employment and Doctors - not in village, Scout Hut - on Long Hyde Road. 3/5

### Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?

- N @ 30 DPH = 56, Y @ 20 DPH = 37

### Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.

- No Parish Plan. SAP responses: Allotments and open space provision should be incorporated into any development. Concerns over additional traffic running through the village and lorry movement / workers from Kane Foods / Long Lartin Prison along Long Hyde Rd.

### The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement

- Would not affect the character of area although would need to be in keeping with existing settlement form.

### Site ruled in or out of SWDP

- In

### Summary

- This site is considered appropriate for future development. Highways are supportive of site subject to complying with design standards. Comments received through the Preferred Options consultation from the Landscape Officer indicate that the development of the whole of the site would not be appropriate. Suggested to avoid higher part of site. Avoid development on land off Long Hyde Lane. Significant Change: Reduce number of dwellings on site to 20. Reduce site area to incorporate land off Station Road for frontage development only.
**MAJOR CRITERIA**

- **Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary**: Yes
- **Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA)**: Yes
- **Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone**: Flood zone 1
- **Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station**: Yes
- **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway**: Yes
- **Sewerage and Water supply adequate**: No
- **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No**: No
- **Access on private road adjoining onto Chapel Lane single track lane not appropriate for large scale development. Improvements required to School Lane. Possible visibility issue on Church Lane/Pershore Road junction**: Yes
- **Sewerage and Water supply adequate**: No
- **Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance**: Yes
- **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No**: No
- **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type**: Yes, open countryside/ agriculture and detached residential properties
- **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network**: No
- **There is no significant net loss of protected open space**: No
- **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area**: No
- **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)**: No
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument**: No
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve**: No
- **Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site**: Biodiversity Action Plan within 25 metres
- **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs**: No
- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland**: No
- **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it**: No
- **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land**: Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study
- **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land**: Low likelihood of contamination
- **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance**: 260m to bus stop by church with a limited service and 500m to stops on Worcester/ Stratford Road
- **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**: 190m to school 430m to shop/post office and 300m to village hall
- **Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%**: 6 dwellings at 30 dph
- **Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan**: This development is too small to contribute significantly to the parish councils aspirations
- **The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement**: Sensitive small scale development of this site would not be out of character with the setting but any required changes to access could affect the character of this very rural lane
- **Site ruled in or out of SWDP**: Out
- **Summary**: This site would only be appropriate for a maximum of 3 dwellings due to access limitations and the character of the immediate surrounds. Also further contact would need to be made with land owner to ensure deliverability within the plan period. Too small to allocate
### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>Available in 5 years owner for development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Access would need to be made to the site through an existing private service road that provides access and a parking area for a small number of units and may require significant upgrading and formal adoption by the Highway Authority. A deep ditch also runs the length of the eastern boundary which provides drainage for the village and would need to be crossed to gain access to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Available in 5 years owner for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Residential and open countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Traditional orchard - grassland needs survey, excellent ecological connectivity, within pond network; adjacent woodland in south east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Biodiversity Action Plan within 25 metres. WW object to the allocation of this site as it is wholly within what appears to be a traditional orchard, a BAP priority habitat and potentially valuable ecological resource. Allocation of this site would be unsound without further work. Believe the orchard contains rare species of apple tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no net loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>No events identified - although standing water on site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting Identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Appropriate housing development could assist in the delivery of the Parishes aspirations to develop a parish park for adults and youths and to improve potential cycle facilities. Parish also keen to develop village tennis court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>The village is a mix of road frontage development that tends to be more traditional in design and also small cul-de-sac developments from the 1970s. Less dense development may be appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</th>
<th>Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Aside from highway and drainage issues which could both be overcome WW have objected to the site W as it wholly within what appears to be a traditional orchard, a BAP priority habitat and potentially valuable ecological resource. Allocation of this site would be unsound without further work. Believe the orchard contains rare species of apple tree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Biodiversity Action Plan within 25 metres. WW object to the allocation of this site as it is wholly within what appears to be a traditional orchard, a BAP priority habitat and potentially valuable ecological resource. Allocation of this site would be unsound without further work. Believe the orchard contains rare species of apple tree.
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>84-5 Ruled Out scale / access/ location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Available now</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.  
  - Flood zone 1

- Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?  
  - Yes

- The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.  
  - It is understood that there is a current planning permission for sites 84-10 & 12 for which access was agreed. To change the position of this agreed access will be difficult as there is limited scope along the site frontage. A Public Right of Way runs along the eastern site boundary. Site 84-05 can only be accessed through sites 84-10 & 12. It would be acceptable if all three sites were to be developed together for a maximum of 16 units.

- Sewerage and Water supply adequate?  
  - No in principle objection from Severn Trent

- Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?  
  - No

- The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.  
  - Agriculture, open countryside and residential

- There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?  
  - No

- There is no significant net loss of protected open space?  
  - No

- There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?  
  - No

- There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.  
  - No

- There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.  
  - No

- There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.  
  - No

- There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.  
  - No

- There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.  
  - No

- There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.  
  - No

### OTHER CRITERIA

- The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.  
  - Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study

- Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.  
  - Low likelihood of contamination.

- Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.  
  - bus stop under 200m

- Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?  
  - shop and post office 350m, school via public right of way from the rear of the site and is only 150m

- Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?  
  - Only small part of site combined with 84-10 and 84-12 for 16 dwellings = 10%

- Would assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.  
  - Appropriate housing development could assist in the delivery of the Parishes aspirations to develop a parish park for adults and youths and to improve potential cycle facilities. Parish also keen to develop village tennis court

- The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.  
  - This site combined with with 84-10 and 84-12 will enhance the street scene - currently derelict. Care will be needed to landscape the rear of this site that is currently open field and overlooks the church.

### Site ruled in or out of SWDP

- Summary  
  - A small part of this site is appropriate once combined with 84-10 and 84-12 to provide access and a small development that can incorporate links back into the village.
### Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes, supportive site available now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>It is understood that there is a current planning permission for sites 84-10 &amp; 12 for which access was agreed. To change the position of this agreed access will be difficult as there is limited scope along the site frontage. A Public Right of Way runs along the eastern site boundary. Site 84-05 can only be accessed through sites 84-10 &amp; 12. It would be acceptable if all three sites were to be developed together for a maximum of 16 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, residential and open countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No events identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Former garage tanks been filled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>bus stop under 200m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>combined with 84-5 and 84-12 for 16 dwellings = 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Suitable housing development could assist in the delivery of the Parish's aspirations to develop a parish park for adults and youths and to improve potential cycle facilities. Parish also keen to develop village tennis court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not material affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>This site combined with with 84-5 and 84-12 will, enhance the street scene - currently derelict. Care will be needed to landscape the rear of this site that is currently open field and overlooks the church.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would not in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former garage tanks been filled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

Developing this derelict site will enhance the street scene and remove an eyesore and safety concern. Combined with 84-05 and 84-12 safe access can be gained to site. And public footpath links into the village can be enhanced.
**Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed</td>
<td>Land owner for development and available within 5 years</td>
<td>B4-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Single access from B4082 acceptable, provided that junction spacing requirements with A422 junction could be achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes residential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Strong connectivity to wider area; hedgerows and mature trees; remnant orchard; grassland needs checking; riparian feature at southern boundary?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>The space is not protected but partly serves as public open space. (check on site visit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>The site abuts the conservation area and inappropriate development could affect the setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a listed building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Biodiversity Action Plan within 25 metres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>There are TPOs across the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>The site is a historic strategic gap between the settlements of Upton and Snodsbury. Development would be detrimental to the purpose of the strategic gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No tbc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low likelihood of contamination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>200m to bus stop by church with a limited service and 100m to bus stop on A422 Worcester/Stratford Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>65m to shop/post office, 325 m to school and 240m village hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>31 homes at 30 dph would be 20% growth and too much development for the scale of the existing village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Appropriate housing development could assist in the delivery of the Parishes aspirations to develop a parish park for adults and youths and to improve potential cycle facilities. Parish also keen to develop village tennis court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Development of this site would affect character and entrance to the more historic part of the village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site would not be appropriate for development as it performs an important historic strategic gap between the settlements of Upton and Snodsbury.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>84-12 Ruled out Planning Permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA)</td>
<td>Yes supportive site available now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>It is understood that there is a current planning permission for sites 84-10 &amp; 12 for which access was agreed. To change the position of this agreed access will be difficult as there is limited scope along the site frontage. A Public Right of Way runs along the eastern site boundary. Site 84-05 can only be accessed through sites 84-10 &amp; 12. It would be acceptable if all three sites were to be developed together for a maximum of 16 units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes residential and open countryside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No site derelict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No events identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Former garage tanks been filled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>bus stop under 200m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>shop and post office 350m , school via public right of way from the rear of the site and is only 150m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 18%?</td>
<td>combined with 84-10 and 84-5 for 16 dwellings = 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Appropriate housing development could assist in the delivery of the Parishes aspirations to develop a parish park for adults and youths and to improve potential cycle facilities. Parish also keen to develop village tennis court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>This site combined with 84-10 and 84-5 will, enhance the street scene - currently derelict. Care will be needed to landscape the rear of this site that is currently open field and overlooks the church.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Developing this derelict site will enhance the street scene and remove an eyesore and safety concern. Combined with 84-05 and 84-10 safe access can be gained to site. And public footpath links into the village can be enhanced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong> 11 06 land rear of Babylon Lane, 0.45ha</td>
<td><strong>Category 3 Villages Bishampton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land or likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The land is part occupied by a building that has the benefit of a CLU for residential use. The entrance to the site is not clearly demonstrated but is presumed will utilise the existing access from Broad Lane between Jasmine Cottage and Rose Cottage - however this area is subject to a high risk of surface water flooding. There are three listed buildings close to the site and it is considered that the redevelopment of this land for more residential units could have a harmful impact upon their setting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th>11 08 - access - 4.01ha. But part of site could be accessed from Main Street to serve a small development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The strip of land leading to the site from Main Street is too narrow to form an access to serve this site, less than 7m. It may be possible to form a private drive within this area of land in which case development would be restricted to a maximum of 6 units. The site also fronts a track which takes access from Babylon Lane. Whilst Babylon Lane is an adopted highway the track leading to Outfields is not therefore in order to access site from this direction the track will need to be brought up to an adoptable standard. Having said this it is considered that due to the restrictive width of Babylon Lane carriageway and the number of units already served off this road and agricultural uses it would be appropriate to restrict development to no more than 10 additional units. There are two Public Rights of Way which cross the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>residential on part of 3 sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No known flooding issues. But SFRA indicates the western half of the site is recorded as having an intermediate risk of surface water flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>yes - bus stop within 100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>yes - shop and pub within 200m, Village hall within 500m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>whole site - approx 120 dwellings. Small site suggested 6 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement</td>
<td>No - the development would be to the rear of housing on existing road frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDOP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The large site is ruled out for access in the SHLAA but there is a potential to utilise a smaller area of land to the rear of properties fronting onto Main St. The strip of land leading to the site from Main Street is too narrow to form an access to serve this site, less than 7m. It may be possible to form a private drive within this area of land in which case development would be restricted to a maximum of 6 units. The site also fronts a track which takes access from Babylon Lane. Whilst Babylon Lane is an adopted highway the track leading to Outfields is not therefore in order to access site from this direction the track will need to be brought up to an adoptable standard. Having said this it is considered that due to the restrictive width of Babylon Lane carriageway and the number of units already served off this road and agricultural uses it would be appropriate to restrict development to no more than 10 additional units. There are two Public Rights of Way which cross the site. The site lies to the rear of a row of houses fronting onto Main Street. The land slopes round from the road and is lower lying than the houses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Criteria</th>
<th>Blackminster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>BL 06-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>developed within the plan period (e.g through SHLAA)</strong></td>
<td>Over 50% of land Flood Zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>County Highway to confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No residential on this stretch of Birmingham Road, B3/B8 opposite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>All of the land is either at More Intermediate Risk from Surface Water Flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No up to date information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Phase 1 and 2 surveys req'd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>No 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Only to Blackminster School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>Gross capacity of site is 24. Even frontage development would increase the total stock by more than 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No Parish Plan produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>No as there is no residential development on the stretch of Birmingham Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Inappropriate to allocate main reason - flooding. Other reasons include scale, accessibility to services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHURCH LENCH

**Major Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>21.05 - Ruled Out Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards access points from Ab Lench Road would be acceptable, but it is unlikely that the rural road network would be adequate to serve the proposed number of units without substantial improvements. Individual accesses directly on to public highway would be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Some low/medium risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>More than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Too detached from settlement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDIP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Not suitable - too far from village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>21-06 - Ruled Out Location/Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards access points from Ab Lench Road would be acceptable, but it is unlikely that the rural road network would be adequate to serve the proposed number of units without substantial improvements. Individual accesses directly on to public highway would be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>N - surrounding farmland, exposed hillside and detached from the rest of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Buildings (s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Some low/medium risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>More than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Too detached from settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Not suitable - too far from village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>21-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single access point from Evesham Road would be acceptable, however the ability to provide adequate visibility splays may restrict the level of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No/low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>More than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Could be a suitable site if developed sensitively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Most suitable site in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipeline close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>This site has no site frontage to any public highway, therefore it cannot be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>No/low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No up to date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community Infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Site too small - no access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cleeve Prior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>23-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available in 5 Yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards access to Froglands Lane may be acceptable. There is however a lack of footway provision along Mill Lane which may need to be addressed as part of this development site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Y - adj residential and farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>CA adj - Conservation have made an objection to this site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>The site lies in the extended Conservation Area adjoining the built form. Any development would need to be of a high standard and sympathetic to its setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>LB adj site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOS.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low - Phase 1 with application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.</td>
<td>N - 500m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>2/ 5. Shop - not in village, Doctors - not in village, Employment - not in village, Village Hall - check location, School - 540m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No Parish Plan. SAP response - Access could be on Froglands Lane, this site is related to the village. Ensure CA Appraisal is taken into consideration. Should be preserved as open space, concern over the amount of HGV traffic. Support for extending the school playing fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>The site has remnants of ridge and furrow and would therefore need further investigation by Conservation Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Was consulted on at preferred option for 8 dwellings but withdrawn due to impact on historic landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Criteria</td>
<td>Other Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>23-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avail in 5 Yrs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>This site has no frontage to any public highway and is served by a track known as Quarry Lane. This is a private road over which a public right of way runs, this is not suitable as a means of access to serve the site. There are other PROWs which cross the site. The junction between Quarry Lane and B4085 is substandard in terms of visibility to the south and without third party land cannot be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/ surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y - adj school and protect open space.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Protected open space.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site is developed to the north is adj CA and LB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>Not considered by GI Group. Site has not been considered by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low - Phase 1 with application.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y - 92m</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 / 5. Shop - not in village, Doctors - not in village, Employment - not in village, Village Hall - check location, School - 130m</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No Parish Plan. SAP response - Development in this location would not appear out of place. Little ecological importance on the site and no flood risk. The promoter has indicated two potential access points into the site both of which have in principle agreements to their use (drawings submitted). Logical extension to the village capable of providing an appropriate housing mix including a proportion of affordable housing. Support for extending the school playing fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td><strong>securing appropriate access could affect the character as applicant needs to demonstrate that they have sufficient land for crossing points. The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and the setting is currently open countryside and therefore sensitive development would be appropriate. Existing properties that surround the site would need to be respected.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site is not considered suitable for future development. Highways are not supportive due to visibility concerns on Quarry Lane and PROW running through the site. SHLAA site 23-6 adjacent this site has been ruled out for Access / PPG17.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Answer/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Reference</strong></td>
<td>23-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, i.e through SHLAA.</strong></td>
<td>Available 5 -10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Access to the existing Nursery is between Owls End and Old Prop, this does not form part of the development parcel, therefore the site has no access to a public highway. Subject to junction design complying with design standards the existing Nursery access would be acceptable. There is however a lack of footway provision along Mill Lane which may need to be addressed as part of this development site also due to the straightness of Mill Lane traffic speed may be an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>? - Residential to south of site, to the west of site (separated by a field) SWS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>SWS lies to West of the site - although field separates the site and SWS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Low / Medium - Phase 1 with application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>N - 950m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>1 / 5 - Shop - not in village, Doctors - not in village, Employment - not in village, Village Hall - check location, School - 1km.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>13 @30 dph - N would not increase stock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>SAP response - Support for extending the playing field at the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>Check - lies to West of the site - although field separates the site and SWS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Answer/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

This site is not considered suitable for future development. Site is a brownfield site but is distant from the key services within the village. Highways have concerns over lack of footway on Mill Lane and traffic speed may need to be reduced along this road. Out of keeping with existing development form. Adj SWS.
| **Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary** | 3 |
| **Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).** | Yes - Landowners (through SWDP PO Consultation) have now indicated that the site is available. |
| **Check site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.** | No - Floodzone 1 |
| **Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?** | Yes |
| **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.** | Tight to the edge of the carriageway is a dilapidated building currently supported by scaffolding, the presumption being that this building is either listed or worthy of retention as it has not been demolished due to its apparent dangerous state in close proximity to the public highway. If this is the case then the renovation of this building will restrict access to the site by virtue of impeding any visibility requirements. If the building were to be demolished then access to the site subject to complying with current standards would be acceptable. A 2m wide footway should be provided across the site frontage. This will however result in the removal of the whole of the frontage hedging and mature trees. |
| **Sewerage and Water supply adequate?** | No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water |
| **Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.** | No |
| **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?** | No |
| **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.** | Yes |
| **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?** | Yes |
| **There is no significant net loss of protected open space?** | The site is part within the conservation area, however it is not anticipated that the development of this site would be detrimental. Conservation objection: Any development here would have a detrimental impact on the currently open setting of the conservation area and that of listed buildings. |
| **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled/ Ancient Monument.** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.** | No TPOs on site. Landscape comments: prominent site on entrance to village/Con Area. Tree Loss in Con Area. Loss of traditional orchard trees. |
| **There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.** | No |
| **There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.** | No |
| **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.** | Small area of Less Risk surface water flooding across entrance to the site. |
| **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.** | Predicted grade 5. |
| **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.** | Ibc |
| **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.** | Yes - 10m. |
| **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?** | Pub - 125m. |
| **Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?** | Yes. However, the village did not have any allocations in the previous Local Plan and has only had 1 house built between 2001-2010. 10% increase would be 3 houses, but it is felt that 10 houses can be accommodated on this site. |
| **Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.** | Currently a dilapidated building on land and remains of cottage on highway. No Parish Plan, but the development of this site, if done sensibly would improve this site which is situated within the Conservation Area. |
| **The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.** | No. The character of development in the settlement is quite dispersed and therefore the development of this site would not materially affect the character of the settlement. |
| **Summary** | Although the site does contain a number of trees, none of these are subject to a TPO. In selecting the site for the development of 10 houses, it is hoped that the trees at the front of this site could be retained. As the site is situated within the Conservation Area, any development here would need to be of a high design standard. Following on from the Significant Changes consultation, it is now proposed to reduce the number of houses to 6 dwellings to allow retention of trees. |
### Crossway Green

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>45C-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### MAJOR CRITERIA

| Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary | 3 |
| Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA). | Yes |
| Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone. | Flood Zone 1 |
| Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. |
| Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA). | Yes |
| Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone. | Flood Zone 1 |
| Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. |

#### OTHER CRITERIA

| Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone. | Subject to junction design complying with design standards in particular visibility and junction spacing requirements with Bishops Wood Lane a single point of access to serve this development may be acceptable on to the A4025. No individual direct access to properties will be acceptable. |
| Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | Subject to junction design complying with design standards in particular visibility and junction spacing requirements with Bishops Wood Lane a single point of access to serve this development may be acceptable on to the A4025. No individual direct access to properties will be acceptable. |
| Sewerage and Water supply adequate? | No in principle objection from Severn Trent |
| Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? | No |
| The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. | Yes - residential adjoining |
| There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | TBC |
| There is not significant net loss of protected open space? | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. | TBC |
| The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it. | No |
| Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. | No |
| Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. | Low-medium risk - Phase 1 with application |
| Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance. | No - 550m |
| Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? | Employment opp 350m (pub) |
| Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? | 22 dwellings - 22% |
| Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan. | No VDS, Parish Plan. No SAP comments |
| The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement. | Existing houses front onto road - this development would require single point of access - different character to existing, prominent site when viewed from the west. |

#### Summary

Existing houses front onto road - this development would require single point of access - different character to existing, prominent site when viewed from the west. Bus stop more than 400m away (550m) and Crossway Green very small settlement with few facilities other than a pub (which is also counted as an employment opportunity) - but it is not considered to be an appropriate location for new development for sustainability reasons.
MAJOR CRITERIA

Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary

Available in 5 years. Landowner & agent supportive

Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?

Yes

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.

Yes and No. This site has no frontage to any public highway and can only be accessed via third party land. To the north east of the site there are three cul-de-sacs, Laston Close, Newton Close and Bramley Close. Access through any one of these Closes would be acceptable subject to land requirements. However the potential to develop the site would be restricted to 100 units which would include those already served off Geneva Crescent.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate?

No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.

TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?

No

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.

Yes. Houses to the north

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?

TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.

There is no significant net loss of protected open space?

TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?

No

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).

No

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

No

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.

No

There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.

No

There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.

No

There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.

TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.

There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.

TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.

The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.

No

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.

No up to date information mapped

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.

Low

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.

Yes. Bus Stop: 200m

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?

Yes. School: 704m, Village Hall: 956m

Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?

Yes. 4.4 x 30dph = 132 (higher than 10% increase)

Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.

Parish Plan identified a need for affordable homes and mix of homes- i.e. bungalows and sheltered housing.

The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.

The development of this site would create a dense mass of housing to the south of the village. Site is too large for size of village.

OTHER CRITERIA

Site ruled in or out of SWDP

Out

Summary

Site not suitable- too large in scale and would create two large housing estates. Possibly develop smaller piece of land running parallel with current development.

Crowle

SHLAA site reference

26-02

Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary

3

Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).

Available in 5 years. Landowner & agent supportive

Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.

1

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?

Yes

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.

Yes and No. This site has no frontage to any public highway and can only be accessed via third party land. To the north east of the site there are three cul-de-sacs, Laston Close, Newton Close and Bramley Close. Access through any one of these Closes would be acceptable subject to land requirements. However the potential to develop the site would be restricted to 100 units which would include those already served off Geneva Crescent.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate?

No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.

TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?

No

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.

Yes. Houses to the north

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?

TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.

There is no significant net loss of protected open space?

TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?

No

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).

No

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

No

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.

No

There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.

No

There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.

No

There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.

TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.

There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.

TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.

The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.

No

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.

No up to date information mapped

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.

Low

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.

Yes. Bus Stop: 200m

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?

Yes. School: 704m, Village Hall: 956m

Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?

Yes. 4.4 x 30dph = 132 (higher than 10% increase)

Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.

Parish Plan identified a need for affordable homes and mix of homes- i.e. bungalows and sheltered housing.

The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.

The development of this site would create a dense mass of housing to the south of the village. Site is too large for size of village.

Summary

Site not suitable- too large in scale and would create two large housing estates. Possibly develop smaller piece of land running parallel with current development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></th>
<th><strong>26-10- R/O: Location. Part of site: 1.55ha</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Landowner supportive. Available in 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Floodzone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Previous pre-apps/applications have concluded that a single access off Church Road is acceptable subject to design standards being met. New footpaths are required to link the proposed site with the existing footpath network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Houses to the north of site. New parish hall to south east of site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Predicted Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Bus stop: 350m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. School: 550m, village hall: 184m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Revised proposal of 25 houses would not increase total housing stock at April 2010 by more than 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Parish Plan identified a need for affordable homes and mix of homes- i.e. bungalows and sheltered housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>By developing northern part of site, this would not detrimentally affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Would allow pedestrian link through to Bredicot Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Northern part of site 26-10 would be more suitable for development. As closer to the core of the settlement and facilities including parish hall. Whole site submitted is too large for size of settlement. Through discussions with the developer of the site, it was established that the western boundary of the site was incorrectly drawn in the Preferred Options. Therefore as Significant Change propose to amend the site boundary and increase by 5 dwellings to 25 dwellings which would still reflect a low density and maintain a rural feel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**
# Shlaa Site Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Available now, Landowner supportive.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes, Subject to junction design complying with design standards access from Froxmere Road will be acceptable. Individual direct access to properties will be acceptable.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes, Subject to junction design complying with design standards access from Froxmere Road will be acceptable.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td><strong>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes, Houses to the west of the site, farm to the north.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td><strong>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td><strong>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No up to date information mapped.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes, Bus Stop: 235m</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes, School: 673m, Village Hall: 854m (No)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes, 3.35 x 30dph = 100 (higher than 10% increase) If were to develop linear strip: 0.53ha x 30dph = 15 dwellings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parish Plan identified a need for affordable homes and mix of homes - i.e. bungalows and sheltered housing.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Would link the current development up to the two dwellings south of Rectory Farm, issue with creating linear development.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Out</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Summary | Requires site survey, Developing part of site may be suitable. Alternative site. |
## Deford

### SHLAA site reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27-4 ruled out duplication and scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available now Landowner supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Upper Street is an unclassified road to which frontage development would be acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, housing and agriculture, open countryside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</th>
<th>Lower part of site subject to surface water issues only develop on higher ground along road frontage of Upper Street.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low likelihood of contamination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No Parish Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs &amp; in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Need to reduce site to sit comfortably with village character. The site is currently used or arable farming and has glimpses through to Bredon Hill and is visible from the main road and further afield although hedge and tree planting could provide screening as in the case of existing properties on this street. There is a hedge row interspersed with the occasional tree running along the site boundary on Upper Street but with a large gateway onto the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

This site could be sensitively developed with 6 dwellings along the road frontage and screening to the rear.
## MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>27-6 (Ruled out scale and access)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, i.e. through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Available in 5 years, landowner supportive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The alignment and width of Harpley Lane is not considered appropriate to serve a high level of development. The case put forward by developer suggests suitable access could be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Adjacent to Regional/local site of wildlife importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Although buffering required adjacent to railway line and residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Site too large for village would need to be reduced to sit comfortably with village character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low likelihood of contamination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes 150m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>20m to village hall, 400m to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>5 dwellings proposed (less than 10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Site too large for village would need to be reduced to sit comfortably with village character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to boundary change and no road frontage for development a small cul-de-sac development behind existing dwellings would be appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OTHER CRITERIA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></th>
<th><strong>27.7 Ruled out Duplication and PPG17</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period.** *(e.g. through SHLAA)*

- **Available landowner supportive**

- **Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.**

- **No Flood Zone**

- **Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**

- **Yes**

- **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**

- **No access at all on own. Would need to punch through Main St or part of larger scheme**

- **Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**

- **No in principle objection from Severn Trent**

- **Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.**

- **Adjacent to Regional/local site of wildlife importance**

- **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?**

- **No**

- **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.**

- **Residential**

- **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?**

- **There is not significant net loss of protected open space?**

- **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?**

- **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).**

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.**

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.**

- **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.**

- **There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.**

- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.**

- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.**

- **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.**

- **Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.**

- **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.**

- **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.**

- **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?**

- **Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?**

- **Would assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.**

- **The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.**

- **Site ruled in or out of SWDP**

  - **Out**

**Summary**

No access at all on own to this site. Would need to punch through Main St or form part of larger scheme. However any access onto Main Street is unlikely to be supported by Highway Authority.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available landowner supportive</td>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available landowner supportive</td>
<td>Only access of Main Road not supported by Highway Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Flood Zone 1</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to Regional/ local site of wildlife importance.</td>
<td>Adjacent to Regional/ local site of wildlife importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Safe access can not be acheived.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Shlaa Site Reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through Shlaa), Available in 5 years, landowner supportive</td>
<td>No Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. Subject to junction design complying with design standards access from Hill View would be acceptable. Access from Church Lane is considered not acceptable.</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, school, residential and open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgeow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low likelihood of contamination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes 230m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>360m to village hall, 20 metres to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>7 dwellings at 30dph, 10% increase would be 24 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Small site with access from Church Lane considered unacceptable, if access can be gained from Hill View potential for 5 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available now, landowner supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The alignment and width of Spring Bank is not considered appropriate to serve the level of development identified. If this were to be promoted then development should be restricted to one or two properties at the end of the road, however previous planning history would suggest that this would not be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes residential and agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Listed building adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Low likelihood of contamination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400 m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes 190m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>265m to village hall, 320m to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>19 dwellings at 30dph, 10% increase would be 24 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Development would need to be very low density due to visual impact and highways are not supportive of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Concerns about access to site and visual prominence - If could gain access off Spring Bank could provide 2 / 3 units. Too small to allocate.
Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary

Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).

Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.

Sewerage and Water supply adequate?

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?

The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?

There is no significant net loss of protected open space?

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.

The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?

Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.

Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?

Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.

The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.

Site ruled in or out of SWDP

Summary

Elmley Castle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>35-01- R/O: Availability Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access from a track then onto adopted road, though adopted road is very small (Hill Lane) - no information from WCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>N - open countryside AONB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Conservation area could be effected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>LBs are adjacent to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No/low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No shop in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>More than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>More than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Could damage character of the village - edge of conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Unsuitable site - poor access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>35-03- R/O: Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Previous planning applications for affordable housing served off Hill Road were opposed on highway grounds due to the substandard nature of Hill Lane and the restricted junction arrangements with Kersoe Lane. No improvements have been undertaken therefore we would resist development on this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>Near to SSSI site (Bredon Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>N - open countryside AONB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Conservation area could be effected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>LBs are adjacent to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No/low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No shop in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>More than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Could damage character of the village - edge of conservation area. Would only be suitable for a limited amount of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Difficult access but could be developed as a small site, would have to be sensitively developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Criteria</td>
<td>Other Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>35-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No pipeline close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>Dogwalk is a private road accessed off Hill Road. Previous planning applications for affordable housing served off Hill Road were opposed on highway grounds due to the substandard nature of Hill Lane and the restricted junction arrangements with Kersoe Lane. No improvements have been undertaken therefore we would resist development on this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>Near to SSSI site (Bredon Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - surrounded by residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>TPOs on part of site: 19/05/1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>No risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>Predicted Grade 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - Bus stop: 300m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>No shop in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>No. 10% housing increase would be 22 houses. Amending development boundary would equate to 3 to 4 houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Could not ascertain whether village had Parish Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>No. By developing this site for 3 to 4 houses, this would not detrimentally affect the character of the settlement. Site is currently a sawmills, with some buildings that are in decline. If sensitively developed at a low density, this could improve the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In as boundary amendement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Could be suitable for small amount of infilling, subject to Highways approving access. Site is too small for an allocation in the SWDP, but propose to amend the development boundary to allow for infill development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>Hanbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>СШLAA site reference</td>
<td>44-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available now. Agent supportive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Improvements to B4090/B4091 junction will be required to access this site. This could take the form of a new route through site as option. In order to achieve this the full development potential of the site will be required. With the exception of within the vicinity of the Veron Arms (B4090 / B4091 junction) access to frontage development to the B4090 may be acceptable subject to accesses meeting required standard for turning/parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Next to residential houses and pub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Site covered by intermediate and less flood risk. Very small part of the site is covered by more risk zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information mapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Under 180m. Two bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes/No. School 2037m (No) Village Hall 877m (Yes). Employment (Jinny Ring) 1240m (No).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes. (9.87 x 30dph = 296) Much higher than 10% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No. Hanbury PP identifies the need for a balance of housing to meet the needs of the local community. However it states that there is no desire for further large residential development sites in the parish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>If the whole site were to be developed then this would significantly affect the character of the settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site is not suitable in the form of its submission to the SHLAA as it is far too large in scale for the size of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>44-04. R/O PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>Available now. Agent supportive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s),</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>Part of site covered by less flood risk zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No up to date information mapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes. 98m from bus stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>Yes/No. School: 2.2km (No), Village Hall: 675m (Yes), Employment (Jinny Ring) 1.3km (No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>No. (0.38 x 30dph = 11) 11 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community Infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Yes. Harbury PP identifies the need for a balance of housing to meet the needs of the local community. However it states that there is no desire for further large residential development sites in the parish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>The development of this site would not affect the character of the settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>The development of this site would be small in scale but suitable in terms of the needs identified in the Parish Plan. There are no other suitable sites due to greenbelt restrictions. Site has now been granted planning permission for 9 dwellings allocation will be carried forward to SWDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Yes- Landowners have indicated land is available in 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Small part of site within high risk floodzone as seen on Wychmaps (data supplied by Environment Agency). However, additional evidence supplied by landowner indicated that EA have acknowledged that floodplain has now been amended and excludes this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes. Subject to junction design complying with current standards the potential for single access or frontage development to Harrow Lane C2032 would be acceptable, however visibility requirements to C2032 could limit development opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Site has housing to the north of Harrow Lane. Next to the site on the East is The Galton Arms PH, individual properties to the West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No. Site is not within Conservation Area but is adjacent conservation and next to listed building (Galton Arms- Grade II listed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Site is next to Listed Building (Galton Arms- Grade II listed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>In assessing SFRA, there is an area of intermediate risk on Harrow Lane covering the entrance to the site. There is also an area of less risk across part of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Predicted Grade 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC by Contaminated Land Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes- bus stop: 110m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes- pub: 20m, school: 400m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>If this site were to be developed for frontage development only then this would not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This site would be suitable for the development of 6 dwellings for frontage development only. The site is adjacent the conservation area and next to a listed building (Galton Arms). Although this is a good site, it is not materially better than the Preferred Options allocation (48-02). There may be issues with the site from a conservation point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>48-02 (previously ruled out as availability unknown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Landowners have now indicated that the land is available in 5 years. Landowners are supportive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, Sixth Flood zone</td>
<td>No, Floodzone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>The lane to the west of the development area whilst public highway is in terms of width and alignment considered unsuitable to serve the development proposals. Improvements to this lane could be considered but it must be questioned whether or not this will be within the developers ability to deliver such improvements. Frontage development with direct access to this lane would be acceptable with minimum improvement works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/ surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, the site is surrounded by residential uses either side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/ landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Area of less flood risk in SFRA on road fronting site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Site not assessed by Contaminated Land Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/ No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Bus stop: 110m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. School: 570m. Hall: 362m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No. 0.44 x 30dph = 13. 6/8 dwellings would be more suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Site off Harrow Lane already has residential abutting either side of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Suitable site for development in village. Central location- would allow infilling between existing houses on Harrow Lane. Suggest allocation of 6 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SHLAA site reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>48-03 (previously unknown availability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Landowners have indicated that site is now available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No. Floodzone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Not assessed by highways as further away from centre of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes: No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Site is situated opposite housing to the north of Harrow Lane and had housing to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Site not assessed by Contaminated Land Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Bus stop: 156m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. School: 646m, pub: 314m, Hall: 556m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No 0.58 x 30 = 17. However, 5-6 dwellings would be more appropriate for frontage development only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No. If this site were to be developed for frontage development only this would not detrimentally affect the character of the settlement. Development would need to be sensitive as this site is an entrance to the village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site ruled in or out of SWDP**

Out

**Summary**

Site could accommodate 5-6 dwellings, in the form of frontage development. However in comparison to other sites in the village, this is further removed from facilities and does have an area of surface water flooding across the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>48-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available now. Agent supportive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available now. Agent supportive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes and No. The lane to the west of the development area whilst public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highway is in terms of width and alignment considered unsuitable to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the development proposals. Improvements to this lane could be considered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but must be questioned whether or not this will be within the developers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to deliver such improvements. Frontage development with direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to this lane would be acceptable with minimum improvement works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological importance. TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessed by GI Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open fields. The site itself contains cricket ground and playground.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. TBC adjacent Conservation Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled/ Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No up to date information mapped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Bus stop: 140m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. School: 134m, Village Hall: 617m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. 3.38 x 30qph = 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village is dispersed in nature. Developing this site would be in line with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the dispersed nature of the village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very large site includes cricket ground and school playing ground. Not set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against road- would have to be accessed via track. Not suitable- large site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and too removed from centre of the village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER CRITERIA

SHLAA site reference

48-04
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes, Site available in 5 years. Landowner supportive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small part of site within high risk floodzone as seen on Wychmaps (data supplied by Environment Agency). However, additional evidence supplied by landowner indicated that floodplain has now been amended and excludes this site.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Site has housing to the north of Harrow Lane. Next to the site on the East is The Galton Arms PH, individual properties to the West.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Site has housing to the north of Harrow Lane. Next to the site on the East is The Galton Arms PH, individual properties to the West.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Site is not within Conservation Area but is adjacent conservation and next to listed building (Galton Arms- Grade II Listed).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is next to Listed Building (Galton Arms- Grade II listed).</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Submerged Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Predicted Grade 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes- bus stop: 110m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes- pub: 20m; school: 400m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes. 1.1 x 30 = 33 houses- higher than the suggested 10% increase (which would be 17 houses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community Infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDPA</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If whole of site were to be developed, this would be too large and not inkeeping with scale and pattern of development in the village. Frontage development may be more appropriate to ensure housing is inkeeping with the development pattern in the village. Too large in size for allocation.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kemerton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
<td>Kemerton 417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-03: R/O: Availability Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>The site is a paddock forming part of a farm but there are spacious detached residential buildings in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site falls within Conservation Area so would need to be designed sensitively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>There is a Listed Building adjacent to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>The site falls adjacent to an area deemed as 'low risk' in the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 273 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>181 m to church / 676 m to village hall / 636 m to shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No - site area 0.3 giving approx 9 units @ 30 dph, however smaller amount of units (6 or less?) may be more appropriate given location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>The Parish Plan states that there would be strong resistance to new residential development in Kemerton. The SAP village questionnaire summary suggests AGAINST: Concerns about impact on AONB, potential access issues and that the setting of nearby listed buildings could be affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Site ruled out - availability unknown - objection from neighbour and Carver Knowle (farm tenants) - however site is within the existing development boundary comprising grazing land bound by copse woodland stone walling off a fairly narrow road and looks feasible from an officers point of view but unable to allocate.
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Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary?
Landowners have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.

Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.
Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?
The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.
Sewerage and Water supply adequate?
The site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.

Is the site in Green Belt?
The site is an agricultural yard that falls within a row of existing residential properties.
The site is within 5 years.

Would assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.
The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.

Summary
Site ruled in or out of SWDP

Over half of this site falls within the development boundary of Kemerton and is an existing agricultural yard. Small scale development here would not be inappropriate. The site also lies within the AGLV and AONB. Officers consider that an extension to the development boundary to include the agricultural yard and silos could be considered here. The site comprises existing agricultural buildings and attractive stone barns - would lend itself to conversion and limited new build. It lies partly within the Conservation Area so would need to be sensitively designed. Suggest allocation of 9 units.

OTHER CRITERIA

SHLAA site reference
54.05

MAJOR CRITERIA

Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.
Available in 5 years

The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. Subject to junction design complying with design standards access to this site would be acceptable if existing access to Park farm were to be closed and moved southwards so as to form a staggered crossroads with Jobs Lane.
Yes

Sewerage and Water supply adequate? No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water

Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?
The site is an agricultural yard that falls within a row of existing residential properties.

There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? No comments received from group on category 3 villages

There is no significant net loss of protected open space? No

There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? Approx one third of the site falls within a Conservation Area

There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)? No

There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. No

There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. No

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. Yes - low - Phase I with application

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No
Yes - 249 metres

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? Yes - 249 metres

Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? No - site area = 0.4 giving approx 12 units @ 30 dph, however 9 units may be more acceptable

Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan. The Parish Plan states that there would be strong resistance to new residential development in Kemerton. The SAP village questionnaire summary suggests FOR: Site is less prominent, existing farm buildings could be converted and there is an acceptable access AGAINST: Concerns about sewerage and parking issues.

The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.

No

Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. Yes - low - Phase I with application

Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No
Yes - 249 metres

Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? Yes - 249 metres

Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? No - site area = 0.4 giving approx 12 units @ 30 dph, however 9 units may be more acceptable

Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan. The Parish Plan states that there would be strong resistance to new residential development in Kemerton. The SAP village questionnaire summary suggests FOR: Site is less prominent, existing farm buildings could be converted and there is an acceptable access AGAINST: Concerns about sewerage and parking issues.

The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.

No

Site ruled in or out of SWDP

In

Over half of this site falls within the development boundary of Kemerton and is an existing agricultural yard. Small scale development here would not be inappropriate. The site also lies within the AGLV and AONB. Officers consider that an extension to the development boundary to include the agricultural yard and silos could be considered here. The site comprises existing agricultural buildings and attractive stone barns - would lend itself to conversion and limited new build. It lies partly within the Conservation Area so would need to be sensitively designed. Suggest allocation of 9 units.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong> 54-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Residential to north and east on other side of road. Site itself is agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site falls within Conservation Area so would need to be designed sensitively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgegrow.</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Site has been flagged up on SFRA maps and is deemed to have 'less risk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Yes - low - Phase I with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 218 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>518m to church / 270m to village hall / 230m to shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No - site area = 0.19 giving approx 5 units @ 30dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>The Parish Plan states that there would be strong resistance to new residential development in Kemerton. The SAP village questionnaire summary suggest FOR: that existing buildings on the site make it less sensitive and potential for redevelopment AGAINST: would lead to higher density development in the centre of the village which would be out of character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This small site falls within the development boundary of Kemerton and comprises existing agricultural buildings and attractive stone barns - would lend itself to conversion. It lies within the conservation area so would need to be sensitively designed. The site also lies within the AGLV and AONB. Also road is fairly narrow so numbers will need to be kept to a minimum. Concerned that Highways would need Cotswold stone wall removed. The site should be ruled out on these grounds and it is considered more suitable as a windfall site as may not achieve 5 units here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>94-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No pipeline near</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Due to the narrow access points indicated along the St James Close frontage access to this site is not possible due to width and visibility restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - surrounding area is residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Areas of less risk cover most of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>No/low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - surrounding area is residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes - to village hall and first school. No shop in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Would be a difficult site to develop, effectively a backland site (with some of the site being garden land).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Unlikely to be a suitable site - difficult access and would be difficult to design in a suitable way because of the layout of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lower Moor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>47-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, i.e. through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No - flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to the required standards being met in order to provide a safe access off Blacksmiths Lane, access to serve the site would be accepted from this road. Visibility splays in either direction of 2.4m x 43m will be a minimum requirement. In view of the size of site and frontage to Field Barn Lane development lends itself to individual properties taking direct access onto the road, this is something which we would not oppose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential to north and east, agricultural land to south and very small wooded area to west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Low risk of surface water flooding along road frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Yes - grade 1 - but only minimal loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes - approx 50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Shop/post office now closed (cou to residential only) but PH hoping to offer some po facilities 300m. Hall 400m. No doctors surgery, school or employment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>27 (10%) but probably frontage only so approx 10 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Hill and Moor have a parish plan but it pre-dates establishment of formal procedure for adoption as Local Information source (LIS) - so is not technically a LIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>High and in places dense hedge to road boundary - preferable to keep with service road to rear to provide frontage development behind hedge? Relatively flat site, no obvious division between this site and 47-10. Highways would support individual or joint access - depends on desire to retain hedge? Note since initial site visit the hedge has been lowered to approx 2m max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>High and in places dense hedge to road boundary - preferable to keep with service road to rear to provide frontage development behind hedge? Relatively flat site, no obvious division between this site and 47-10. Highways would support individual or joint access - depends on desire to retain hedge? Note since initial site visit the hedge has been lowered to approx 2m max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
<td>47.06 scale, access, prominent site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary.</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, flood zone 1</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to access this site a major junction would have to be formed on to the A44. Given the close proximity of the first roundabout on the Wyre Piddle Bypass it is unlikely that such an arrangement can be achieved. The site appears to have an agricultural access serving it at the moment off this roundabout. Notwithstanding the land availability to form a suitable access appearing to be inadequate, the additional traffic flows on this junction should access be taken from it, would more than likely require improvement works to enhance capacity which would require additional land outside of the site. It is our opinion that access to this site cannot be achieved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/No, please state type.</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A44 to north of site - less desirable. Residential to south and part west, and to east beyond footpath - Footpath along eastern boundary of site</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less risk of surface water flooding</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low risk - Phase 1 with application</td>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, one on site boundary by A44 and next closest to south of site approx 60m.</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop/post office now closed (ou to residential only) but PH hoping to offer some po facilities. Hall 55th. No doctors surgery, school or employment opportunities.</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 units - 15%</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community Infrastructure needs e.g in Parish Plan.</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill and Moor have a parish plan but it pre-dates establishment of formal procedure for adoption as Local Information source (LIS) - so is not technically a LIS</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways consider difficult to achieve suitable access. Large open site, would have significant impact on character of village.</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards, access from Blakes Hill would be acceptable albeit it is likely the removal of the mature hedge across the whole site frontage would have to be removed. Individual accesses serving properties would be acceptable. New and improved off site footways should be considered to improve pedestrian connectivity with the village centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Residential adjacent to east and west, agricultural to north and road frontage and open field to south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low likelihood of contamination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>500 metres to bus stop at Ivy Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>1km to the Village Hall, 500m to Homer Joinery and 1.3 km to both Kanes food and Pete Bott skip hire employment sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>15 dwellings at 30dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Non identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>The proposed site is on the route into the settlement and would provide a link between two stretches of linear development before reaching the heart of the settlement. Road frontage development would be most appropriate and characteristic rather than cul-de-sac development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Allocated in SWDP and recent permission for 10 dwellings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>60-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Land owner is for development and the site is available within 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, Stati Flood zone.</td>
<td>No in zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards, access from School Lane would be preferred because of the industrial estate access road off Cleeve Road opposite the site. Individual accesses serving properties could be considered but when accessed off Cleeve Road adequate turning facilities must be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Yes/no, please state type. Residential adjacent and large employment site opposite although very well screened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Medium to low likelihood of contamination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>20m to bus stop on Cleeve Road (B4085)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>300m to Village Hall. 75m to Kanes Food, 110m to Pete Bott Skip Hire and 890m to Homer Joinery employment sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>20 dwellings at 30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Non identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>The character of the settlement is made up of a series of cul-de-sacs and closes with some limited linear road frontage development, therefore development on this site would not detrimentally affect the character of the settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP.</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Issues over access make this a less preferable site with HGV movements and junction onto B4085. If necessary these could be addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

- **Access to public transport (bus stop)**: 20m to bus stop on Cleeve Road (B4085).
- **Has reasonable access to local services**: 300m to Village Hall, 75m to Kanes Food, 110m to Pete Bott Skip Hire and 890m to Homer Joinery employment sites.
- **Would not increase total housing stock**: 20 dwellings at 30 dph.
- **Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs**: Non identified.
- **The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement**: The character of the settlement is made up of a series of cul-de-sacs and closes with some limited linear road frontage development, therefore development on this site would not detrimentally affect the character of the settlement.
**SHLAA site reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>60-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Land owner is for development and the site is available now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>90% of site in zone 1 small area of site in zone 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards, access from School Lane would be preferred because of the narrow carriageway widths and lack of footways along Arrow Lane. Individual accesses serving properties could be considered from both School Lane and Arrow Lane. New and improved off site footways should be considered to improve pedestrian connectivity with the village centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes residential, open fields several footpaths through site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Ibc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area.</td>
<td>Site is adjacent to conservation area and small scale sensitive development could be appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>Site would be visible from Tithe Barn and listed buildings across the road but Heritage Officers consider this to be detrimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>Site would be visible from Tithe Barn limited development could be screened. Objections from English Heritage and the National Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>South eastern part of site subject to Intermediate and less risk of surface water flooding (approx 10% of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Ibc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance...</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>150m from bus stop at Ivy Inn and 500m from bus stop on Evesham Road (B4085) 900m to Village Hall, 330m to Homer Joinery and 1.2 km to both Kanes Food and Pete Bott Skip Hire employment sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>63 dwellings at 30dph would be too large to develop across the whole site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Unable to develop along the road frontage on School Lane due to surface water and flooding issues. Concern over developing on site at all due to visual impact on setting of SAM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Criteria

- **Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary**
- **Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period,** (e.g through SHLAA).
- **Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.** Land owner is for development and the site is available now.
- **Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**
- **The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.** Subject to junction design complying with design standards, access from School Lane would be preferred because of the narrow carriageway widths and lack of footways along Arrow Lane. Individual accesses serving properties could be considered from both School Lane and Arrow Lane. New and improved off site footways should be considered to improve pedestrian connectivity with the village centre.
- **Sewerage and Water supply adequate?** Yes
- **Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.** No in principle objection from Severn Trent
- **Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?** No
- **The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.** Yes residential, open fields several footpaths through site.
- **There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?** No
- **There is no significant net loss of protected open space?** Ibc
- **There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area.** Site is adjacent to conservation area and small scale sensitive development could be appropriate.
- **There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).** Site would be visible from Tithe Barn and listed buildings across the road but Heritage Officers consider this to be detrimental
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.** Site would be visible from Tithe Barn limited development could be screened. Objections from English Heritage and the National Trust
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.** No
- **There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.** No
- **There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.** No
- **There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.** No
- **The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.** South eastern part of site subject to Intermediate and less risk of surface water flooding (approx 10% of site)
- **Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.** Ibc
- **Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance...** Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study
- **Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?** 150m from bus stop at Ivy Inn and 500m from bus stop on Evesham Road (B4085) 900m to Village Hall, 330m to Homer Joinery and 1.2 km to both Kanes Food and Pete Bott Skip Hire employment sites.
- **Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?** 63 dwellings at 30dph would be too large to develop across the whole site.
- **Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.** Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study
- **Site ruled in or out of SWDP** Unidentified
- **Summary** Unable to develop along the road frontage on School Lane due to surface water and flooding issues. Concern over developing on site at all due to visual impact on setting of SAM.
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, e.g. through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Land owner is for development and the site is available now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 1a or 1b, State Flood zone. No in zone 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. tbc by crossroads and HGV turn into Kanes Foods could be an issue?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate? No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. Opposite residential adjacent to large employment site, could be disturbed by neighbour use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? Ibc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space? No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s). No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. Ibc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow. Ibc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. High likelihood of contamination Phase I and II surveys with application required and lengthy preapplication discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance. 50m to bus stop on Cleeve Road (B4065)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? 315m to Village Hall. 80m to Kanes Foods. 350m to Homer Joiner. Would replace the employment site Pete Bott Skip Hire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? 56 units at 30dph would be more than 10% growth for the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Non identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<p>| Summary | Residential development on this site would not fit in with the character of the settlement as most development on this side of Cleeve Road is employment use. Wouldn’t want to see loss of employment site. Least preferred site. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td>60-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Land owner is for development and the site is available now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No in zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access can be gained onto the Highway subject to sufficient visibility splays being created. There are several public rights of way across the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Residential either side and opposite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Bc Several footpaths through site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No although there are views through to the Barn which would need to be considered in the design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No although there are views through to the Barn which would need to be considered in the design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>There are ponds close by and habitat survey would be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>There is a well established hedgerow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Washed over by less risk surface water flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Site not surveyed as part of 1988 study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Low likelihood of contamination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Bus stop within 230m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>450m to Village Hall. 300m to Kanes Hotel, 110m to Pete Bott Skip Hire and 1000m to Homer Joinery employment sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>34 units at 30dph would be less than 10% growth for village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Non identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>The settlement would be expanded and coalesce with the next settlement. The site has an established hedgerow which would need to be retained as much as possible to minimise impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site would extend settlement into open countryside. Would affect water views of the SAM and cause damage to established hedgerow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norton juxta Kempsey

| Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary | Available in 5 years- Persimmon Homes. |
| Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone. | 1 |
| Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | Yes |
| The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. | Yes (TBC by Highways) |
| Sewerage and Water supply adequate? | No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water |
| Site would not compromise internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance. | TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group. |
| Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No? | No |
| The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type. | Yes, established housing site to the north and east. Adjacent garden centre. |
| There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group. |
| There is no significant net loss of protected open space? | TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group. |
| There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area? | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s). | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site. | TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group. |
| There is no adverse impact on TPOs. | Yes- TPO (No. 2, NJK) |
| There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap. | No |
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. | TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group. |
| There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow. | TBC by GI Group - Cat 3 villages have not been assessed by GI Group. |
| The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it. | No |
| Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land. | No up to date information mapped |
| Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. | Medium |
| Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance. | No- Bus stop is 600m from site |
| Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site? | Yes. Shop (St. Peters Garden Centre); 227m. Employment: 227m (St. Peters Garden Centre), 1154m (SMH Fleet Solutions Ltd), 2872m (Envisor) |
| Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%? | Yes- 3.18 x 30dph = 95 (just over 10% increase) Planning application is for 74 dwellings |
| Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan. | Identified a need in consultation responses for open space |
| The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement. | The development of this site would not detrimentally affect the character of the settlement. If developed, this site would result in a rounding off of the Norton Barracks development. |
| Site ruled in or out of SWDP | Out has planning permission |

Summary

This is the most suitable site for development in Norton Juxta Kempsey. The site is situated close to services including the shop and bus routes into Worcester. Since time of assessment, site now has planning permission.
SHLAA site reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>64-06- R/O: Duplicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g., through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available - Agent G Herbert Banks - not stated timescale for availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes (TBC by Highways)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Houses to north and south, next to football ground and rifle range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Yes - whole site is allocated SR10 (Strategic Gap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Less and Intermediate risk strip running through the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No - Grade 3b and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>450m from bus stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Shop (St. Peters Garden Centre: 751m), Employment: 751m (St. Peters Garden Centre), 1644m (BMH Fleet Solutions Ltd), 3350m (Enviroson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes - 14.34 x 30dph = 430 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Identified a need in consultation responses for open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>The development of this site would materially affect the character of the settlement. By developing this site there would no longer be a strategic gap between Norton and Worcester City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Currently designated as a Strategic Gap (SR10) in the Local Plan. This site is not suitable for development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duplicated</td>
<td>64-08-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA.)</td>
<td>R/O:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Houses to the north M5 runs along eastern side of site. Farm to north east of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green infrastructure Network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site/ Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes. Selected piece: 5.69ha x 30dph ≥ 170 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Identified a need in consultation responses for open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>The development of this smaller site out of the larger strategic site put forward would not materially affect the character of the settlement. The site would fit in with the current Norton Barracks development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

This site (if the small part developed) would not detrimentally affect the character of the settlement. However, site WY61 is more suitable as it rounds off the development and is further away from the motorway.
**SHLAA site reference:**

64-11- R/O: Duplicated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>64-11- R/O: Duplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, i.e through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Landowner supportive. Available within 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes off Brockhill Lane and Church Lane (TBC by Highways)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes, however- next to train line and M5 to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site/ Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No. Very small part of site has less risk and intermediate risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information mapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>550m from bus stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Shop (St. Peters Garden Centre: 750m), Employment: 750m (St. Peters Garden Centre), 685m (SMH Fleet Solutions Ltd), 2294m (Envirosort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes. 5.7ha x 30dph = 171 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Identified a need in consultation responses for open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>The development of this site would alter the character of the settlement. Currently, the village of Brockhill has a buffer of Church Lane and Brockhill Lane from the railway line and the M5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
This site is not suitable. Development would have to be linear and would mean that development would occur against the railway line to the north and M5 to the east. At the moment Church Lane and Brockhill Lane are a clear boundary to the settlement, helping to maintain a rural feel to the development.
## MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Landowner supportive (Promenade Developments Ltd, rep. Bell Cornwell). Available now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes. Subject to junction design complying with design standards, access from Woodbury Lane, this would however likely to require improvements along Woodbury Lane and at the junction with B4084. Individual accesses serving properties would be achievable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</th>
<th>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No. Next to business park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerows.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Strip of Less Risk running through site. Also Highways Flooding Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information mapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>450 m from bus stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Shop (St. Peters Garden Centre: 2966m), Employment: 2966m (St. Peters Garden Centre), 1767m (SMH Fleet Solutions Ltd), 222m (Envirosort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes. 7.5 x 30 dph = 225 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Identified a need in consultation responses for open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>The development of this site would affect the character of the settlement, creating a dense housing area which is otherwise made up from sparsely located houses along Woodbury Lane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site ruled in or out of SWDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SHLAA site reference:** 64-12

This site is not suitable for housing development. The site is situated next to a current employment site and along the railway line. Developing this site would set a precedent for new housing development, which would be better suited alongside the Norton Barracks development. This site would be more suitable for an employment use.
## Major Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>64-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, i.e. through SHLAA.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>No. The site has no direct access to any public highway. Therefore without third party land access cannot be achieved. The nearest public highway is Church Lane which is considered unsuitable for the level of development proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes- surrounded by fields. Adjacent M5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information mapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance</td>
<td>No. Bus stop: 750m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Shop (St. Peters Garden Centre: 1026m), Employment: 1026m (St. Peters Garden Centre), 330m (SMH Fleet Solutions Ltd), 2059m (Envirosort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Yes. 4.5 x 30dph = 135 (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Summary | This site is not suitable for a non-strategic allocation. The site runs parallel to the motorway and is detached from both Norton Barracks and the older settlement of Norton. |
**SHLAA site reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>64-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**MAJOR CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, i.e. through SHLAA.</th>
<th>Landowner supportive- Available within 5 years.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b or State Flood Zone.</td>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes if in conjunction with 64-20. This site does not front a public highway, therefore can only be developed in conjunction with site 64-20. (see comments).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner supportive- Available within 5 years.</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes. Residential to the north and fields to south.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No up to date information mapped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Bus stop: 110m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Shop (St. Peters Garden Centre: 312m), Employment: 312m (St. Peters Garden Centre), 1970m (SMH Fleet Solutions Ltd), 165m (Envirosort)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No, 0.28ha x 30dph = 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Identified a need in consultation responses for open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>This site would only be able to accommodate a small number of houses. By developing this site, the density of Woodbury Park would be intensified creating a dense housing development in open countryside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER CRITERIA**

**Summary**

This site is not suitable for a non-strategic allocation. It is too removed from the centre of the village and its associated services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>64-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Landowner supportive- Available within 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes. Subject to junction design complying with design standards, access from Woodbury Lane would be acceptable. Individual accesses serving properties would be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>Yes in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Opposite industrial estate next to small residential development of Woodbury Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No- Small corner of site is covered by less risk designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information mapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Bus stop: 130m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Shop (St. Peters Garden Centre: 3.2km), Employment: 3.2km (St. Peters Garden Centre), 2041m (SMH Fleet Solutions Ltd), 47m (Envirosort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No. 2.16 x 30dph = 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Identified a need in consultation responses for open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>The development of this site is next to a small isolated housing development, so development of this site would be a continuation of this housing, which is not in accordance with the isolated nature of development in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP.</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This site is not suitable for development as it would create an area of dense housing in an otherwise sparsely developed village. The site is also opposite a small scale industrial park which involves the continual movement of HGVs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
<th>64-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Landowner supportive- Available within 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes. Subject to junction design complying with design standards, access from Woodbury Lane would be acceptable. Individual accesses serving properties would be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Opposite industrial estate next to small residential development of Woodbury Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

| **Site ruled in or out of SWDP** | Out |
| **Summary** | This site is not suitable for development as it would create an area of dense housing in an otherwise sparsely developed village. The site is also opposite a small scale industrial park which involves the continual movement of HGVs. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MAJOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>OTHER CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No up to date information mapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Bus stop: 54m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Shop (St. Peter's Garden Centre: 3.2km), Employment: 3.2km (St. Peter's Garden Centre), 2041m (SMH Fleet Solutions Ltd), 47m (Envirosort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No. 0.49 x 30dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs i.e. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Identified a need in consultation responses for open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>The development of this site is next to a small isolated housing development, so development of this site would be a continuation of this housing, which is not in accordance with the isolated out nature of development in the village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td><strong>SHLAA site reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. (e.g through SHLAA)</strong></td>
<td>69-01 - Dorsington Road - ruled out - Availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes- residential to east, south and west, road frontage to north</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Approximately half of site falls within a Conservation Area so would need to be designed sensitively</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td><strong>A listed building lies to the south of the site adjoining the boundary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not an issue according to the SFRA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No comments received</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes 133 m</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td><strong>155m to church / 619m to hall / 611m to school</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No - site area = 0.88 giving approx 26 units @ 30dph, however consider that low density would be appropriate, therefore approx 12 - 15 units in total?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No Parish Plan adopted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Omission site so owner was known at Local Plan stage and details are on file. Site visit confirmed site unsuitable for development</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>69-03: Bank Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - Residential to north, glasshouses and open field to east, agricultural to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Site falls adjacent to a Conservation Area so would need to be designed sensitively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>A listed building lies to the north of the site - on other side of track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Not an issue according to the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Yes - low / medium - Phase I with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 416 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>256m to church / 775m to hall / 675m to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No - site area = 1.36 giving approx 40 units eg 38 @ 30dph, however consider only part of the site should be developed, therefore approx 15 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

| Site ruled in or out of SWDP | Out |
| Summary | This is a farm site which could, in part, be developed to form approx 15 units. Officers consider that the main ‘Brownfield’ part of the site to the north east would be more appropriate for development than the outlying areas, particularly as access would need to be shared with 69-04 Elm View. Highways objections received for this site following Preferred Options consultation have now ruled out this site. |
**SHLAA site reference**
69-04 - Land rear of Elm View / Chapel View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</strong></td>
<td>Available in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td>This site does not front a public highway, therefore can only be developed in conjunction with site 69-05. (see comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - Residential to north and east, Bank Farm to West, open field to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>Site falls within a Conservation Area so would need to be designed sensitively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedges.</strong></td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>Not an issue according to the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - low - Phase I with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No</strong></td>
<td>Yes - 266 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>357m to church / 200m to hall / 204m to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>No - site area = 0.5 giving approx 15 units @ 30dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No Parish Plan adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

This site comprises some disused glasshouses. Access will be required by demolition of the bungalow on the road frontage (Highway comments are noted, however, this site could be developed on its own and will not need the access off 69-05). This would be an appropriate site to develop 15 dwellings, particularly if a larger site could be formed with 69-03 Bank Farm with a shared access. Was identified in SWDP Preferred Options for 15 dwellings, however landowner has now informed Officers that unwilling to develop site (unavailable). Therefore rule out.
### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>69-05 - Land adjacent Honeybourne Road - rule in = 10 units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, i.e. through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Available Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway. Subject to junction design complying with design standards, access from Stratford Road would be acceptable. Some improvements to the junction of Stratford Road and Chapel Road may be required. Individual accesses serving properties would also be achievable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>No - Nursery to south, depot to north and road frontages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedderow.</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>Not an issue according to the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Yes - low - Phase I with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes - 334 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</td>
<td>518m to church / 59m to hall / 367m to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No Parish Plan adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDJP</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site should be ruled back in as would sit comfortably with the depot site adjacent that has pp for 10 units. SWDJP: Allocate for 10 dwellings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site does not front a public highway sufficiently enough to be able to form a suitable access, therefore can only be developed in conjunction with site 69-05. (see comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The adjacent surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - nursery to south, open land north, east and west</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></td>
<td>Not an issue according to the SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></td>
<td>Yes - Medium - Phase I and II with application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</strong></td>
<td>Yes 435 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 600m from proposed site?</strong></td>
<td>474m to church / 127m to hall / 342m to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td>No Parish Plan adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></td>
<td>No Parish Plan adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Consider site is too large and will be too far removed and there are preferable sites that sit more comfortably with the character of the village. This site should be ruled out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHLAA site reference: 69-07 - Land south west of Chapel Road: R/O: Scale/Location
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR CRITERIA</th>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, i.e. through SHLAA.</td>
<td>Yes - Council owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Yes - Flood Zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Access to highway on bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments yet received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site/ Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>A large part of the site is within intermediate surface water flooding risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unlikely - Await comments from contaminated Land Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. 230m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>No. Approx 1km to school and church etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Allocated for 17 units. But in addition to other allocated sites would exceed 10% = 42 (Plus 10 is Chapel Lane also included = 52).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community Infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Site is beyond existing established settlement and quite out of character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Site is within Flood Zone 3 and has intermediate surface flooding risk. Out of character with settlement pattern. Would exceed 10% housing with other sites within village. SWDP: Propose to delete site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER CRITERIA</th>
<th>SHLAA site reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69-11: Chapel Road, Pebworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Yes - Council owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No (Flood Zone 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Yes - site is set back from the road. Access can be gained between Chapel Road dwellings but narrow. Seek Highways advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objections from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes - residential surrounding and other SHLAA sites adjacent taken forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No comments received as yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Adjacent to Conservation Area. Access within CA unless gained through 69-04.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No comments received from group on category 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No surface water flooding issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Unlikely - Await comments from contaminated Land Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is it within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. 250m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. School Hall and Church within 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>Allocated for 10 units. But in addition to other allocated sites would exceed 10% = 40 units (plus 17 in Broad Marston Road also included = 57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No Parish Plan adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Site is beyond existing road-fronting development but surrounding areas also selected within SHLAA and being carried forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP.</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Site is adjacent to CA and Dev Boundary. Would need to develop this site in conjunction with 69-04. However landowner of 69-04 has now informed us that land is now unavailable. Therefore propose to delete site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tibberton</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>83-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>83-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Available now, Landowner supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access unto the public highway.</td>
<td>An access point near canal bridge will be unacceptable due to visibility issues. Therefore this site can only be developed in conjunction with site 83-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>SWS (canal) will require substantial buffering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td>Surrounded by houses on Foredraught Lane. Next to Pub (The Bridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>SWG (canal) will require substantial buffering; remnant orchard; check for grassland interest; strong hedge to lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>Remnant orchard; check for grassland interest; strong hedge to lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Adjacent Conservation Area (Worcester &amp; Birmingham Canal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>SWG 100m. Adjacent Site of Regional or Local Wildlife Importance (ENVS)- Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>Remnant orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>Strong hedge to lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No up to date information mapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes, Bus Stop: 75m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. School: 273m, Village Hall: 245m, Shop: 360m, Doctors: n/a. No employment opps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Fairly centrally located. Concern over location next to canal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td>83-04- Duplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floodzone 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Available in 5 years. Owned by Worcester Diocese, Agent supportive (Anthony Champion-Halls).**

**Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Is the site in Green Belt? Yes/ No?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?**

| Yes |

**The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.**

| Yes | Church Lane. Subject to junction design complying with design standards access to Foredraught Lane would be acceptable as would individual direct access to properties. |

**Sewerage and Water supply adequate?**

| No |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High likelyhood of Great Crested Newts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Is the site in Green Belt? Yes/ No?**

| No |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes- farm buildings (check) and fields</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes there could be detrimental impact. Excellent hedgerow connectivity; old enclosure pattern; mature trees; check grassland; strong adjacent pond network (at least 12 ponds within 500m; nearest pond &lt;25m; high likelihood of great crested newts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible: Adjacent two Listed Buildings: Gordon’s Cottage &amp; Lawn Farm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes there could be detrimental impact. Excellent hedgerow connectivity; old enclosure pattern; mature trees; check grassland; strong adjacent pond network (at least 12 ponds within 500m; nearest pond &lt;25m; high likelihood of great crested newts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mature Trees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No up to date information mapped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Bus Stop: 650m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. School: 899m, Village Hall: 920m, Shop: 774m, Doctors: n/a, No employment opps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Looks to be steep land- would be prominent if developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

| Too removed from centre of village and associated facilities. |
**SHLAA site reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>B3.06- Duplicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Available now, Landowner supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Floodzone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards access to Foredraught Lane would be acceptable as would individual direct access to properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>SWS (canal) will require substantial buffering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Surrounded by houses on Foredraught Lane. Next to Pub (The Bridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>SWS (canal) will require substantial buffering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>SWF (canal) will require substantial buffering; remnant orchard; check for grassland interest; strong hedge to lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>Adjacent Conservation Area (Worcester &amp; Birmingham Canal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>SWS 100m. Adjacent Site of Regional or Local Wildlife Importance (ENVS) Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>Remnant orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Strong hedge to lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No up to date information mapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Bus Stop: 75m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. School: 273m, Village Hall: 245m, Shop: 369m, Doctors: n/a. No employment opps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No=(0.3ha x 30dphr 9) 9 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Centrally located. Possible issues with location next to canal. Concerns over access of Foredraught Lane. Possibly after PO consider larger area of land available from landowner. Suggest allocation of 5 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SHLAA site reference

**83-07**

### MAJOR CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>Available in 5 years. Landowner supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone.</td>
<td>Floodzone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>This site has no direct access to a public highway and can only be developed with the purchase of third party land. Access from Foredraught Lane would be acceptable if an existing residential dwellings were to be purchased and demolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>SWS 100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Yes- Surrounded by houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>Strong hedgerow network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no significant net loss of protected open space.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>SWS 100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>Strong hedgerow network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</td>
<td>Yes. Bus stop: 400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>Yes. School: 557m, Village Hall: 598m, Shop: 464m, Doctors: n/a. No employment opps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>No. (0.46 x 30dph= 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td>Currently a linear settlement. Development of this site would create infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Intending to knock down a house to allow acceptable access to the site. Situated to the rear of two rows of properties-creating backland development. Does not appear to have access from Hawhorne Rise. Do not consider that this site is materially more suitable than the site at The Bridge Inn, off Foredraught Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Wythavon owned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, State Flood zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthrorn Rise considered suitable for access, maximum of 100 units in total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including existing properties. New access to adoptable standard required for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>south western part of site with 2.4m x 33m splay. Possible part frontage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development. Gradients may be an issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no, please state.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Hawthorn Rise is a fairly recent development adjoining site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no significant net loss of protected open space?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC by GI Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no stats distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Bus stop: 180m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. School: 412m, Village Hall: 485m, Shop: 372m, Doctors: n/a. No employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opps.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. (0.95 x 30 = 28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of this site would not materially affect the character of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settlement as surrounding residential uses surround site. Only issue with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site is the height of the land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially an acceptable site. Possible concern over height if land/sloping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any development would need to be low rise - i.e. only bungalows. Would be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suitable for up to 20 houses. Suggest allocation of 15 dwellings. Suggest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocation of 15 dwellings. Significant Changes proposal. Mixed use to possibly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodate village hall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SHLAA site reference**

83-09- (Previously R/O: Availability Unknown)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHLAA).</td>
<td>Land owner is for development and it is available now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</td>
<td>No Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</td>
<td>Subject to junction design complying with design standards, access from Walkers Lane has been agreed with the Land Owner. Individual accesses serving properties would be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</td>
<td>No in principle objection from Severn Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/No?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</td>
<td>Residential and major road infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</td>
<td>No b/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</td>
<td>There are TPOs on sites that would need to be considered in layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</td>
<td>No Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no stats distance</td>
<td>280m to bus stop on A44 Whittington Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</td>
<td>1km to school in Whittington village and 1.1km to village hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</td>
<td>Non identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Due to noise issues and the requirement for mitigation a maximum of 15 dwellings could be allocated to this site. This site has planning permission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHITTINGTON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA site reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wychavon Parish Census Data, Historical Allocations, Completions and SWDP Allocations including percentage change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1 Village</th>
<th>Previous Allocations from Local Plan(s) (2001-2010)</th>
<th>Total No. of Units Completed (2001-2010)</th>
<th>Total number of households in parish at 2001</th>
<th>Total Number of households in village at April 2010</th>
<th>Number of houses built 2001 - 2010 as % of village housing stock at April 2001</th>
<th>SWDP Allocation</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badsey</td>
<td>30 (consent granted)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bredon</td>
<td>20 (consent granted for 24)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>4.03%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1442</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>7.63%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>8.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlebury</td>
<td>73 (consent granted for 64)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>3.82%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeybourne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkberrow</td>
<td>22 (consent granted)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>6.92%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombersley</td>
<td>64 (20 granted consent)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>6.97%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wychbold</td>
<td>179 (consent for 51 &amp; 103)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>20.22%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2 Village</td>
<td>Previous Allocations from Local Plan(s) (2001-2010)</td>
<td>Total No. of Units Completed (2001-2010)</td>
<td>Total number of households in parish at 2001</td>
<td>Total Number of households in village at April 2010</td>
<td>Number of houses built 2001 - 2010 as % of village housing stock at April 2001</td>
<td>SWDP Allocation</td>
<td>% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton Under Hill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>3.07%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckford</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bretforton</td>
<td>20 (consent granted for 10)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropthorne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drakes Broughton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckington</td>
<td>20(24)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>3.82%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernhill Heath</td>
<td>216 (consent for 132)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>9.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fladbury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyford Flavell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvington</td>
<td>20 (consent granted for 10)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>10.21%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overbury</td>
<td>No stats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinvin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgeberrow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Littleton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2 Village</td>
<td>Previous Allocations from Local Plan(s) (2001-2010)</td>
<td>Total No. of Units Completed (2001-2010)</td>
<td>Total number of households in parish at 2001</td>
<td>Total Number of households in village at April 2010</td>
<td>Number of houses built 2001 - 2010 as % of village housing stock at April 2001</td>
<td>SWDP Allocation</td>
<td>% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton Snodsbury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 3 Village</th>
<th>Previous Allocations from Local Plan(s) (2001-2010)</th>
<th>Total No. of Units Completed (2001-2010)</th>
<th>Total number of households in parish at 2001</th>
<th>Total Number of households in village at April 2010</th>
<th>Number of houses built 2001 - 2010 as % of village housing stock at April 2001</th>
<th>SWDP Allocation</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishampton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>5.77%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackminster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Marston</td>
<td>No Stats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Lench</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>4.03%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleeve Prior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conderton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossway Green</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowle</td>
<td>50 (consent granted)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutnall Green</td>
<td>No Stats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defford</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmley Castle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>4.23%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanbury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>15.32%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3 Village</td>
<td>Previous Allocations from Local Plan(s) (2001-2010)</td>
<td>Total No. of Units Completed (2001-2010)</td>
<td>Total number of households in parish at 2001</td>
<td>Total Number of households in village at April 2010</td>
<td>Number of houses built 2001 - 2010 as % of village housing stock at April 2001</td>
<td>SWDP Allocation</td>
<td>% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himbleton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemerton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleworth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Moor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and Middle Littleton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Juxta Kempsey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pebworth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>7.17%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peopleton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke Prior</td>
<td>No Stats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibberton</td>
<td>50 (consent granted)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>36.08%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton Warren</td>
<td>No Stats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1 Worcester SHLAA Sites Not Considered Against Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA Site reference</th>
<th>Reason for not assessing against criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W003 (Land South of Trotshill)</td>
<td>Site allocated for allotments and public open space associated with adjacent housing development which is built out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W004 (Gregory’s Bank Industrial Estate)</td>
<td>Outline Planning Permission (P12M0021) granted for up to 170 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W005 (Former Tolladine Goods Yard)</td>
<td>Existing allocated employment site with outline planning permission and part built out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W007 (Land at Taylors Lane)</td>
<td>Part of Worcester South Strategic Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W009 (Land at Swinesheard Way)</td>
<td>Site developed with a new church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W014 (Earls Court Farm)</td>
<td>Part of Worcester West Strategic Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W015 (250 Bransford Road)</td>
<td>Planning permission P11C0419 for 158 houses approved in February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W017 (Worcester City Football Club)</td>
<td>Planning application P07M0711 for 98 dwellings approved in July 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W020 (202 Bransford Road)</td>
<td>Planning application P10C0557 for 89 dwellings was approved in September 2011 and is now under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W021 (Land at Broomhall Way)</td>
<td>Part of Worcester South Strategic Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W022 (Fruit &amp; Veg Market)</td>
<td>Planning application P10J0553 for a sports arena was approved in March 2001 and is now under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W023 (Highway Depot Malvern Road)</td>
<td>Planning application P07C0408 which included a new sports centre on this site was approved in November 2007 and has been built out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W024 (Clare Street Car Park)</td>
<td>No (The landowner has indicated that this site will not be made available for development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W025 (Commandery Road Car Park)</td>
<td>No (The landowner has indicated that this site will not be made available for development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W029 (Wildon Engineering Ltd)</td>
<td>No (this site comprises a car park owned by the Royal Grammar School and an ATS tyre depot, neither of the landowners have indicated that they will make the site available for development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W034 (Warndon Service Station)</td>
<td>This site has not been promoted by the owner is currently occupied by a second hand car dealer and the development panel consider the site too small for inclusion in the SHLAA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA Site reference</td>
<td>Reason for not assessing against criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO38 (Land at Ronkswood Hill)</td>
<td>This site is in mixed ownerships, the landowners have not indicated that the site is available for redevelopment and the SHLAA panel considered the topography and relationship of the site to adjacent development would not be attractive to a housing developer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO40 (Land adjacent to the Paul Pry PH)</td>
<td>No (Planning application P00L0109 for 9 dwellings has been implemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO43 (Derwent Close Industrial Estate)</td>
<td>This site is owned by Lansdowne Rodway a commercial property company who have not indicated that they will make this site available for redevelopment. This location has lower than average residential values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO44 (Land adjacent to the Maple Leaf PH)</td>
<td>Yes (Planning application P07C0150 for 21 dwellings was approved in June 2007 and has been implemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO46 (St Richards Hospice)</td>
<td>The owner of this site has not indicated that the site is available for development and it is considered that any additional development on this site would be detrimental to the setting of this listed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO47 (Orchard Street Industrial Estate)</td>
<td>This site is in multiple ownerships. There has been no indication from any of the landowners that sites will be made available for redevelopment. Any redevelopment would be likely to have to remove a culvert under the site which is associated with surface water flooding events. Opening up Duck Brook which flows through the culvert would substantially reduce the developable area and may make any development unviable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO49 (Copenhagen Street Car Park)</td>
<td>The owners of this site (Worcester City Council) have not indicated that it will be made available for redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO50 (Car Park to the Rear of Corel Bingo Club)</td>
<td>The owners of this site have not indicated that it will be made available for development and it would be difficult for any development to provide adequate standards of residential amenity in this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA Site reference</td>
<td>Reason for not assessing against criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W051 (Austin House Castle Street)</td>
<td>The owners of this site have not indicated that it will be made available for development. The premises are occupied by a viable business. The SHLAA panel consider this site would be suitable for student accommodation. The building has recently been listed making comprehensive redevelopment undesirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W054 (Nash's Passage New Street)</td>
<td>No (Planning application P02L0426 for 16 apartments was approved in April 2003 and has now been fully implemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W055 (Commandery Road Filling Station)</td>
<td>This site is occupied by a viable business and the landowner has not indicated that the site will be made available for redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W056 (Tansell Garage Diglis Road)</td>
<td>The owner of this site has stated that it will not be made available for redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W057 (26 &amp; 26a Bath Road)</td>
<td>No (Planning application P05D0171 for 22 apartments was refused in Jun 2005. The developer/landowner has since gone into administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W058 (Trinity Works London Road)</td>
<td>Although there has been some developer interest in this site in the past since a change in ownership in 2009 the existing employment use seems viable. The site was ruled out by planning officers as protected employment land at the beginning of the SHLAA process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W061</td>
<td>Number not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W062</td>
<td>Number not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W063 (Land at Woodbury Lane, Norton)</td>
<td>This site was promoted for commercial development as an alternative to the Worcester Technology Park proposed allocation. The size and open nature of this site makes development in this location undesirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W064 (Gwillams Farm)</td>
<td>This site is a strategic allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W065 (Moathouse Farm, Perdiswell)</td>
<td>A small part of this site (owned by the City Council) is a proposed allocation for leisure/community uses. The remainder of the site is within the Green Belt and has other environmental constraints on development such as flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W070 (Boughton Park Golf Course)</td>
<td>The owners of this site have not indicated that it will be made available for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W073 (A44 Car Sales, Bromyard Road)</td>
<td>The landowner is not promoting this site for development and the site is within the floodplain of Laughern Brook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA Site reference</td>
<td>Reason for not assessing against criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO75 (Land at Droitwich Road/Claines Lane)</td>
<td>This site is within the Green Belt and is not being promoted for development by the landowner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO78</td>
<td>Number not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO79</td>
<td>Number not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO82 (Moor Street Clinic)</td>
<td>The new Health and Care Trust which controls this building are no longer committed to disposal of these premises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO83</td>
<td>Number not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO85 (Land North of Cherry Acre/Taylors Land)</td>
<td>Part of Worcester South Strategic Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO87 (Ravenmeadow Golf Course)</td>
<td>This site is within the Green Belt and therefore could only be an allocated development site if there were no other suitable locations for development to support Worcester's needs. As there is only green belt to the north of the city it is clear that there are alternative directions for growth other than within the green belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO89 (Spicers Yard)</td>
<td>This is an active commercial complex where piece meal development as proposed would be inappropriate and would not achieve acceptable levels of residential amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO90 (Royal Mail Sorting Office Westbury Street)</td>
<td>The owner of this site has not confirmed that they will make the site available for development before 2030.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO91 (A44 Service Station Bromyard Road)</td>
<td>The only access to this site is within flood zone 3b. Residential development therefore could not be supported on this site while sequentially lower flood risk sites are available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO97 (Land at Wainwright Road/Berkeley Way)</td>
<td>The best use of this site is for new commercial premises which have planning consent and this is not a location that could provide acceptable levels of residential amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO99 (Essex Close)</td>
<td>This site is too small (max 4 units) for a site allocation but may still come forward as windfall development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO100 (Harrington Road)</td>
<td>This site is too small (max 4 units) for a site allocation but may still come forward as windfall development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO105 (Land at Junction of Blackpole Road and A449)</td>
<td>This site is within the Green Belt and therefore could only be an allocated development site if there were no other suitable locations for development to support Worcester's needs. As there is only green belt to the north of the city it is clear that there are alternative directions for growth other than within the green belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA Site reference</td>
<td>Reason for not assessing against criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO106</td>
<td>Number not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO107 (Land to the rear of Kingston Avenue)</td>
<td>The access to this site crosses an area of flood zone 3b. There is therefore no dry access to this site in the event of flooding and development in such locations should be avoided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 Malvern Hills Sites Ruled Out in the SHLAA.

Please note the majority of these sites have not been considered against the criteria as the reason for ruling them out in the SHLAA has meant that they do not meet with the major criteria e.g. ownership is unknown and the site is unavailable, or they are in a floodplain, or they are removed from the settlement boundary etc. Also many sites are duplicated with several cuts of the same piece of land sitting on the SHLAA database; in most cases these will only have been considered once if they meet with the major criteria, unless the variation in boundaries requires them to be considered again.

There may be some instances where a site appears on both lists for example when Officers have considered them and they have subsequently been granted planning permission for development. Also some large sites that were ruled out in the SHLAA may have been considered by Officers with reduced site areas than that originally proposed.
## Sites ruled out in SHLAA in Malvern: Towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Town/Village</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHMT01</td>
<td>South West Woodend Farm Upper Welland</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT03</td>
<td>Cowleigh Park Farm Cowleigh Park</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT06</td>
<td>Land At Cales Farm North Site</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT10</td>
<td>Land at Halfkey Road</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT11</td>
<td>Land at Poolbrook West off Mill Lane</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT13</td>
<td>Land at Elms Farm Lower Howsell</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT14</td>
<td>Former Gas Works Lower Howsell Road</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>ELR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT22</td>
<td>Land to east of Wells Rd</td>
<td>Malvern Wells</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT23</td>
<td>Beehive Farm Halfkey Lane</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT26</td>
<td>Former Coal Yard St Andrews Road</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT27</td>
<td>Land at Worcester Road</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT29</td>
<td>Land East of Holywell Road (see MHMT56)</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT33</td>
<td>Land at Greenfields Road</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>PPG17/AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT35</td>
<td>Land East of Townsend Way</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT39</td>
<td>Land to South of Guarford Lodge</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT40</td>
<td>Townsend Tanks off Goodson Road</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT42</td>
<td>Land off Kings Road, Malvern Wells</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT44</td>
<td>Land N.W. of North End Lane</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT51</td>
<td>Land S.of Brook Farm Drive</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>ACCESS / LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT52</td>
<td>Land East of Mill Lane Poolbrook</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>ACCESS/UNVIABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT54</td>
<td>Poolbrook School Buildings Bluebell Close</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>UNAVAILABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT56</td>
<td>Land West of Wells Road (MHMT29)</td>
<td>Malvern Wells</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT60</td>
<td>Morgan Works Pickersleigh Ave</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT62</td>
<td>Land to south of Poolbrook School</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT63</td>
<td>Former Youth Centre</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT64</td>
<td>St Anne's Orchard, Worcester Road</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>SIZE/PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT65</td>
<td>Former Health Centre, Victoria Road</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>BUILT OUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT67</td>
<td>The Old Malvern Bottling Works, Belle Vue Terrace</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>SIZEACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT68</td>
<td>County Council Recycling Centre</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT69</td>
<td>Former Auction House Portland Rd</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>SIZE/PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT73</td>
<td>Land at Silver Hill</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>ACCESS/AONB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT74</td>
<td>Hayslan Field (part MT16)</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT76</td>
<td>Former workshops &amp; tennis courts, Montpelier Road</td>
<td>West Malvern</td>
<td>UNVIABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Town/Village</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT77</td>
<td>Former School Grounds, Montpelier Road</td>
<td>West Malvern</td>
<td>NATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT80</td>
<td>18 Peachfield Road</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>NATURE/ AONB/PPS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT81</td>
<td>Land at Haysian Avenue</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMT83</td>
<td>Former Hillstone School, Abbey Road</td>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTW02</td>
<td>Land at College Farm</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells</td>
<td>PPG17 / FLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTW03</td>
<td>Land south of the Oaklands</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTW04</td>
<td>Cattle Market Site</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells</td>
<td>FLOOD/NATURE/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTW05</td>
<td>Business Park (various plots)</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTW06</td>
<td>Field to rear of Wheeler Orchard (School Sports Field)</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTW08</td>
<td>Land off Oldwood Road</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTW10</td>
<td>Little Blagdon, Bromyard Road, Sutton</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells</td>
<td>LOCATION/FLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTW11</td>
<td>Land adjacent Greenhill Springs</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTW12</td>
<td>Land adjacent Westfield Bungalow, Berrington Road</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells</td>
<td>LOCATION/SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTW13</td>
<td>Land to south of Berrington Road</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells</td>
<td>LOCATION/SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTW15</td>
<td>Land adjacent Ivy House, Oldwood Road</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTW16</td>
<td>Land adjacent Kyrewood Road, Greenhill Gardens</td>
<td>Tenbury Wells</td>
<td>SLOPE/NATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHUP01</td>
<td>Land At Buryend Farm Rectory Rd Upton</td>
<td>Upton on Severn</td>
<td>FLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHUP02</td>
<td>Land at the rear of The Graftons</td>
<td>Upton on Severn</td>
<td>PPG17 / FLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHUP03</td>
<td>Land at the rear of the Regal Garage</td>
<td>Upton on Severn</td>
<td>FLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHUP04</td>
<td>Land at Buryend Farm, Bury End Lane</td>
<td>Upton on Severn</td>
<td>FLOOD/ACCESS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sites ruled out in SHLAA in Malvern: Category 1 villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Town/Village</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHA02</td>
<td>Land at Larkrise Abberley Common</td>
<td>Abberley</td>
<td>SMALL/ACCESS/AVAILABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHA03</td>
<td>Land at Abberley Common</td>
<td>Abberley</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHA06</td>
<td>Land adj The Pleck and Rodge Cottage, Netherton Lane Abberley Village</td>
<td>Abberley</td>
<td>LOCATION/ CAT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHC03</td>
<td>Land at Walnut Lodge</td>
<td>Clifton-upon-Teme</td>
<td>ACCESS/AVAILABILITY UNKNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHGW01</td>
<td>Former Coal Yard adjacent Primary School with adj land</td>
<td>Great Witley</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHGW02</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Rectory</td>
<td>Great Witley</td>
<td>NOT AVAILABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHGW05</td>
<td>Land adj Hundred House Hotel</td>
<td>Great Witley</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHA01</td>
<td>Land at Hallow Park</td>
<td>Hallow</td>
<td>PPG17/DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHA02</td>
<td>Field opp Ladygo Lane</td>
<td>Hallow</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHA03</td>
<td>Field opp old car showroom</td>
<td>Hallow</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHA06</td>
<td>Land adj to Laugherne House Main Road</td>
<td>Hallow</td>
<td>ACCESS/AVAIL UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Town/Village</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHA07</td>
<td>Land at Moseley Saw Mill Moseley Road</td>
<td>Hallow</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHA09</td>
<td>Former Listers Garage Main Road</td>
<td>Hallow</td>
<td>NOT AVAILABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHA11</td>
<td>Land off Beaconhill Drive</td>
<td>Hallow</td>
<td>FLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHA12</td>
<td>Land at Hallow Park (revised area MHHA01)</td>
<td>Hallow</td>
<td>PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHA13</td>
<td>Land to rear of Worcester Gate</td>
<td>Hallow</td>
<td>LOCATION/ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHA14</td>
<td>Land to south of Green Hill Lane (part of MHHA02)</td>
<td>Hallow</td>
<td>SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHS01</td>
<td>Land adjacent to St. Gabriel's Church</td>
<td>Hanley Swan</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHS02</td>
<td>Land at Yew Tree Farm</td>
<td>Hanley Swan</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHS04</td>
<td>Via Picken End</td>
<td>Hanley Swan</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHS05</td>
<td>Land rear of Ambleside</td>
<td>Hanley Swan</td>
<td>ACCESS/AVAIL UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHS06</td>
<td>Land at Ambleside</td>
<td>Hanley Swan</td>
<td>ACCESS/AVAIL UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHS07</td>
<td>Land behind St Gabriels Church</td>
<td>Hanley Swan</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHS08</td>
<td>Land at Quakers Farm Welland Road</td>
<td>Hanley Swan</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHS09</td>
<td>Haylers End Waste Incinerator</td>
<td>Hanley Swan</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHS10</td>
<td>Yew Tree Farm (part of MHHS02)</td>
<td>Hanley Swan</td>
<td>SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHS11</td>
<td>Land at Covsides Farm</td>
<td>Hanley Swan</td>
<td>ACCESS/SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHS12</td>
<td>Land east of Welland Rd</td>
<td>Hanley Swan</td>
<td>UNAVAILABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHS15</td>
<td>Land to rear of Albion Lodge</td>
<td>Hanley Swan</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY03</td>
<td>Court Meadow</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>FLOOD/AVAIL UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY05</td>
<td>Land at Bight Farm</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>DUPLICATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY06</td>
<td>Land off Old Road South (amended)</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY11</td>
<td>Land to rear of Florence Close</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY12</td>
<td>Land at Clerkenleap Farm</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY13</td>
<td>Upper &amp; Middle Broomhall Farm</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY14</td>
<td>Land to the North of Lower Broomhall Farm</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY15</td>
<td>Land to the North of Broomhall Lane</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY17</td>
<td>Broomhall Farm, Norton Road</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY18</td>
<td>Land to south of Broomhall Lane</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>SCALE/FLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY19</td>
<td>Land west of Elms</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY20</td>
<td>Land at Cherry Acre</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY23</td>
<td>Land off Post Office Lane (north of)</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY24</td>
<td>Land off Brook End Lane</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>FLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY27</td>
<td>Land at Brookhill Farm, Brookend Lane,</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>SCALE/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY28</td>
<td>Land off Post Office Lane, Kempsey (adj MHKY09)</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY30</td>
<td>Sandy Lane Nurseries, Baynhall</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>LOCATION/ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHKY31</td>
<td>Land to the rear of the Croft, Green Street</td>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>LOCATION/ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHLB01</td>
<td>Land rear of Low Bank</td>
<td>Lower Broadheath</td>
<td>ACCESS/NOT AVAILABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHLB02</td>
<td>Land off Oldbury Road</td>
<td>Lower Broadheath</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHLB03</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Vicarage</td>
<td>Lower Broadheath</td>
<td>PPG17/NOT AVAILABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Town/Village</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHLB04</td>
<td>Land off Bell Lane</td>
<td>Lower Broadheath</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHLB12</td>
<td>Land surrounding Oldbury Farm</td>
<td>Lower Broadheath</td>
<td>SCALE/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHLB13</td>
<td>Land at Peachey Manor Farm Buildings</td>
<td>Lower Broadheath</td>
<td>SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHLB14</td>
<td>Land at Henwick Mill</td>
<td>Lower Broadheath</td>
<td>ACCESS/SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHLB15</td>
<td>Land to south of Oldbury Farm</td>
<td>Lower Broadheath</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHLB16</td>
<td>Land off Ankerdine Road Upper Broadheath</td>
<td>Lower Broadheath</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHLB18</td>
<td>Lovington Farm, Lovington Lane, Lower Broadheath, Worcester, WR2 6QQ</td>
<td>Lower Broadheath</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHLB19</td>
<td>Laugherne Bank, Martley Road</td>
<td>Lower Broadheath</td>
<td>LOCATION/FLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY01</td>
<td>Land adj to the Old Hall</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY03</td>
<td>Land at Martley (adj to MY02)</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY04</td>
<td>Land at Laugherne Villa (Taylors of Martley)</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY05</td>
<td>Land at The Smithy</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>EMP/COMMUNITY/AVAILABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY06</td>
<td>Land at Hillend Sawmills</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY07</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Rectory St Peters Church</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>PPG15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY08</td>
<td>Field adjoining B4197</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY09</td>
<td>Land to south of The Old Tannery</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>PPS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY10</td>
<td>Land adjacent Threeways Nurseries, Barbers Lane</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY11</td>
<td>Land adjacent Thornhill Villa, Thorn Lane</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY12</td>
<td>Land at Prickley farm, Hockhams Lane</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY13</td>
<td>Land adjacent Barley Piece, Hillside</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMY16</td>
<td>Various sites adjacent to Kings Common</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>LOCATION/ACCESS/ NATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHWD02</td>
<td>Land to North of Drake Street</td>
<td>Welland</td>
<td>FLOOD/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHWD03</td>
<td>Welland Garage Gloucester Road</td>
<td>Welland</td>
<td>SIZE/PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHWD04</td>
<td>Land adjacent Juniper Farm</td>
<td>Welland</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHWD05</td>
<td>Lawn Farm, Drake Street</td>
<td>Welland</td>
<td>LOCATION/DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHWD06</td>
<td>Land to rear of Welland House</td>
<td>Welland</td>
<td>ACCESS/FLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHWD07</td>
<td>Land and Buildings at Lawn Farm, Drake Street (includes MHWD05)</td>
<td>Welland</td>
<td>LOCATION/SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHWD08</td>
<td>Land to rear of the Laurels, Gloucester Rd</td>
<td>Welland</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sites ruled out in SHLAA in Malvern: Category 2 villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Town/Village</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHBW01</td>
<td>The Cedars Broadwas</td>
<td>Broadwas</td>
<td>ACCESS/AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHBW02</td>
<td>Land off Church Lane</td>
<td>Broadwas</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHBW03</td>
<td>Land at Broadwas (also know as Cherry Bank)</td>
<td>Broadwas</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHBW05</td>
<td>Land between Church Lane and School</td>
<td>Broadwas</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHBY02</td>
<td>Land at rear of 1 Clows Top road</td>
<td>Baytown</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCE01</td>
<td>Bush Farm</td>
<td>Callow End</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCE02</td>
<td>Field South of 35 Lower Ferry Lane</td>
<td>Callow End</td>
<td>FLOOD/AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCE03</td>
<td>Field east of Lower Ferry Lane</td>
<td>Callow End</td>
<td>FLOOD/AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCE06</td>
<td>Land adj Nutbush, off Jennet Tree Lane</td>
<td>Callow End</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCE07</td>
<td>Land adjacent The Thatchings, No 80 Beauchamp Lane</td>
<td>Callow End</td>
<td>ACCESS/FLOOD/LOCATION/PPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCE08</td>
<td>Land adjacent The Stables, Court Mews, Jennet Tree Lane</td>
<td>Callow End</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCE09</td>
<td>Land at rear of The Court, Jennett Tree Lane</td>
<td>Callow End</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHSU01</td>
<td>Land at Pipe Elm</td>
<td>Leigh Sinton</td>
<td>PPG17/AVAIL UNK/SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHSU02</td>
<td>Off Hop Pole Green</td>
<td>Leigh Sinton</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHSU03</td>
<td>Land to North of Nelson Inn</td>
<td>Suckley</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPW02</td>
<td>Land east of Hospital Lane, Colletts Green</td>
<td>Powick</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPW05</td>
<td>Land adjacent to the Crown, Colletts Green</td>
<td>Powick</td>
<td>SCALE/DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPW06</td>
<td>Land adj to the Crown Inn (part of PW05), Colletts Green</td>
<td>Powick</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPW07</td>
<td>Land off Sparrowhall Lane, Colletts Green</td>
<td>Powick</td>
<td>SIZE/VIABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPW08</td>
<td>Land off Colletts Green Road, Colletts Green</td>
<td>Powick</td>
<td>SCALE/ACCESS/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPW10</td>
<td>Bastonford House, Bastonford</td>
<td>Powick</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPW13</td>
<td>Land adjacent Bastonford House, Bastonford (part of MHPW10)</td>
<td>Powick</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHRW01</td>
<td>Land adj to Upperwick Lane</td>
<td>Rushwick</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHRW04</td>
<td>School Earls Court Farm</td>
<td>Rushwick</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHRW10</td>
<td>Land to West of Village Hall, Bransford Road</td>
<td>Rushwick</td>
<td>SCALE/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHRW11</td>
<td>Land to west of Coronation Avenue</td>
<td>Rushwick</td>
<td>SCALE/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHSU01</td>
<td>Site at Bridge Cottages</td>
<td>Suckley</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHSU02</td>
<td>Land N of Church</td>
<td>Suckley</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHSU03</td>
<td>Land to North of Nelson Inn</td>
<td>Suckley</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sites ruled out in SHLAA in Malvern: Category 3 villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Town/Village</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHBD01</td>
<td>Land rear of the Grove</td>
<td>Bransford</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHBD02</td>
<td>Land to north of roundabout</td>
<td>Bransford</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHBD03</td>
<td>Land at New House Farm</td>
<td>Bransford</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHBD04</td>
<td>Land at the Grove, Suckley Road</td>
<td>Bransford</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHBD05</td>
<td>Land at Stockend Farm</td>
<td>Bransford</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCL01</td>
<td>Land at Corse Lawn</td>
<td>Eldersfield</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCL02</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Primary School</td>
<td>Corse Lawn</td>
<td>PPG17/AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCL03</td>
<td>Land at Link End Road</td>
<td>Corse Lawn</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCL04</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Cranley</td>
<td>Corse Lawn</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCL05</td>
<td>Land at Link End Farm</td>
<td>Corse Lawn</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCL06</td>
<td>Land adj Greenfields, Lime Street, Eldersfield</td>
<td>Corse Lawn</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHEN01</td>
<td>Land at White House Farm</td>
<td>Eardiston</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN/SIZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHEN02</td>
<td>Land at Cutmill Bridge</td>
<td>Eardiston</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHEN03</td>
<td>Land off Mill Lane</td>
<td>Eardiston</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHGY01</td>
<td>Church Meadows</td>
<td>Grimley</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHGY02</td>
<td>Land at Ball Mill Quarry</td>
<td>Grimley</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC01</td>
<td>Church End House</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>LOCATION/AVAILABILITY UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC02</td>
<td>Land at Hanley Castle</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC03</td>
<td>Land south of Old School</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>SCALE/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC04</td>
<td>Land north of the Old School</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>SCALE/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC05</td>
<td>Land to east of old post office</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>SCALE/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC06</td>
<td>Land to east of Churchend Farm</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>SCALE/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC07</td>
<td>Land to south of Herberts Farm</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>SCALE/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC08</td>
<td>Land to east of former corn mill site</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>SCALE/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC09</td>
<td>Land to south of Hanley Castle High School</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>SCALE/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC10</td>
<td>Land at Quay Lane Farm, Quay Lane</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>FLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC11</td>
<td>Land at Blackmore Business Park Blackmore Park Road Malvern</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC12</td>
<td>Land adjacent Brickwalls Barn, Gilberts End</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC13</td>
<td>Land &amp; Buildings at the Elms, Gilbert End</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC14</td>
<td>Land at Gilberts End House, Gilberts End</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC15</td>
<td>Hanley Hall Barns, Gilberts End</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>LOCATION/ACCESS/FLOOD/PPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHC16</td>
<td>Land adj Church End House (part of HC01, HC02)</td>
<td>Hanley Castle</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHG01</td>
<td>Holly Green</td>
<td>Ryall</td>
<td>AVAIL UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHG02</td>
<td>Land East of Ryall Lawn</td>
<td>Ryall</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHG03</td>
<td>Land off The Woodlands Holly Green</td>
<td>Ryall</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Town/Village</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHHT01</td>
<td>Land adjacent to School Lane</td>
<td>Holt Heath</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHLG01</td>
<td>Land opposite Nelson Inn</td>
<td>Longley Green</td>
<td>FLOOD/AVAIL UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHLG02</td>
<td>Bruff Business Centre, Longley Green, Suckley, Worcester, WR6 5DR</td>
<td>Longley Green</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT/SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPD01</td>
<td>Land behind Post Office</td>
<td>Pendock</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN/CAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPD02</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Tuscan Cottage</td>
<td>Pendock</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN/CAT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHSH01</td>
<td>New Inn Lane</td>
<td>Shrawley</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN/CAT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHSH03</td>
<td>Land adj to Noutards Green</td>
<td>Shrawley</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHSH04</td>
<td>Land at 7991 6611</td>
<td>Shrawley</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTH01</td>
<td>Greenfields Farm Hyde Lane</td>
<td>Tunnel Hill</td>
<td>AVAILABILITY UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTH02</td>
<td>Duckswich Poultry Units Yewleigh Lane</td>
<td>Tunnel Hill</td>
<td>LOCATION/ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTH03</td>
<td>Land at the Eades Yewleigh Lane</td>
<td>Tunnel Hill</td>
<td>LOCATION/PPG15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTH04</td>
<td>Land off Old Orchard</td>
<td>Tunnel Hill</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTH05</td>
<td>Land adj Upton Surgery</td>
<td>Tunnel Hill</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTH06</td>
<td>Land at May Cottage</td>
<td>Tunnel Hill</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTH07</td>
<td>Land to the Rear of Karuna House, The Lodge</td>
<td>Tunnel Hill</td>
<td>SCALE/ACCESS/LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTH09</td>
<td>Land opposite Upton Surgery (part MHTH07)</td>
<td>Tunnel Hill</td>
<td>DUPLICATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 Wychavon SHLAA Sites Not Considered Against Criteria

There may be some instances where a site appears on both lists for example when Officers have considered them and they have subsequently been granted planning permission for development. Also some large sites that were ruled out in the SHLAA may have been considered by Officers with reduced site areas than that originally proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Droitwich Spa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32-01 Hampton Lovett Droitwich Spa ELR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-03 Chawson Lane Droitwich Spa Too large for non Strategic site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-04 Land north of Copcut Lane Droitwich Spa Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-05 Pulley Farm, Pulley Lane Droitwich Spa Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-06 Government Buildings Medals Office Droitwich Spa Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-07 Garage site at Stallsfarm Road Droitwich Spa Built Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-10 St Andrews Square, Salters Shopping Centre Droitwich Spa Planning Permission / Retail Led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-14 Site rear of NU-WAL Ltd Droitwich Spa ELR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-15 Friar Street Droitwich Spa Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-18 Land Rover Garage, Hanbury Road Droitwich Spa Flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-19 Rear of Pridzor Road Droitwich Spa Green Belt / Duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-20 Land off Pridzor Road Droitwich Spa Green Belt / Duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-21 Land off Brossgrove Road Droitwich Spa Green Belt / Duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-22 Garage Site at Rose Avenure Droitwich Spa Built Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-23 Collins Yard Tagwell Road Droitwich Spa Built Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-25 Rear of Newland Road Droitwich Spa Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-26 Yew Tree Farm Droitwich Spa Too large for non Strategic site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-27 Newlands Road / Isaacs Way Droitwich Spa Too large for non Strategic site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-28 Pulley Lane Droitwich Spa Too large for non Strategic site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-29 Yew Tree Hill (part) Droitwich Spa Too large for non Strategic site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-30 Copcut Lane (A) Droitwich Spa Duplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-31 Land adjacent to Yew Tree Hill Droitwich Spa Too large for non Strategic site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-32 Land between Kidderminster Road and Railway (Doverdale Park), Hampton Lovett Droitwich Spa Too Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-33 Land between Hadzor Lane and M5, Hadzor Droitwich Spa Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-34 Land north of Roman Way Droitwich Spa Location / Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-37 Copcut Golf Centre &amp; Driving Range, south of Copcut Lane Droitwich Spa Green Belt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Droitwich Spa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32-38</td>
<td>Gaudet Luce Golf Course, Middle Lane, Hadzor Droitwich Spa</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-39</td>
<td>Land adjacent St Richards &amp; St Huberts Church, Gaudet Luce Golf Course</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-40</td>
<td>Land to the rear of 75 High Street Droitwich Spa</td>
<td>Flood/ Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-41</td>
<td>Land to the rear of 11 Queen Street Droitwich Spa</td>
<td>Flood/ Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-42</td>
<td>Land to the rear of 69 High Street Droitwich Spa</td>
<td>Flood/ Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-46</td>
<td>Land off St. Peters Church Lane Droitwich Spa</td>
<td>PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-47</td>
<td>Land off Newland Road Droitwich Spa</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-48</td>
<td>Land to the North and East of Newland Road Droitwich Spa</td>
<td>Duplicate/ Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evesham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37-A02</td>
<td>North of Merrybrook, Hampton. Evesham</td>
<td>Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A06</td>
<td>Land at Clarks Hill Rise, Hampton. Evesham</td>
<td>PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A08</td>
<td>Four Pools Industrial Centre, Evesham Evesham</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A09</td>
<td>Garage &amp; showroom, off Broadway Road roundabout. Evesham</td>
<td>Built Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A10</td>
<td>Land rear of High Street East Evesham</td>
<td>Retail Led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A12</td>
<td>Post Office and surrounding area, off High Street Evesham Retail Led/PP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A13</td>
<td>Land between Blind Lane &amp; Briar Close Industrial Estate Evesham</td>
<td>PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A14</td>
<td>Briar Close Industrial Estate Evesham Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A15</td>
<td>Land West of Greenhill Evesham</td>
<td>Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A16</td>
<td>Land at Twyford roundabout, Greenhill Evesham</td>
<td>Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A17</td>
<td>Land at East of Greenhill Evesham</td>
<td>Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A19</td>
<td>Land to the North of Evendene Road/Charlton Hollow. Evesham</td>
<td>Duplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A21</td>
<td>Land East of A46(T) and South of railway Evesham</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-A22</td>
<td>Land adjacent to A46(T) and north of railway line Evesham</td>
<td>Too Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-N01</td>
<td>Land at South West of Evesham Road Evesham</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-N02</td>
<td>Land rear of Cheltenham Road. Evesham</td>
<td>Duplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-N03</td>
<td>Land at Offenham Road Evesham Planning Permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-N05</td>
<td>Land off Cheltenham Road Evesham</td>
<td>Duplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-N06</td>
<td>Former Orchard, Coopers Lane (rear of hotel) Evesham</td>
<td>Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-N11</td>
<td>Land at Green Avon, Princess Road Evesham Location / Duplicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-N12</td>
<td>Evesham Baptist Church, Cowl Street Evesham</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-N13</td>
<td>Land off Highfield Road Evesham</td>
<td>Duplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-O07</td>
<td>Land at Common Road Evesham</td>
<td>PPG17 / Flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-O09</td>
<td>Land at Greenhill Evesham DUP/ Availability Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-O10</td>
<td>Land off Cheltenham Road (adjacent Brooklands Farm) Evesham Duplication/ Availability Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-O16 Football ground, Common Road Evesham Flood/Built Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-O20 Land North of Kings Road Evesham Planning Permission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-O22 Badsey Road Evesham Planning Permission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-O23 Rear of Childrens Home, Peewit Road Evesham Built Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-O26 Land between Evesham &amp; Hampton Evesham Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U01 Works off Cheltenham Road, (Cornmill Road) Evesham Duplicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U02 Land off Cheltenham Road Evesham Duplicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U04 St. Richards Road Evesham ELR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U05 Evesham Hospital, Waterside Evesham Availability Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U06 Land adjacent Garage, Waterside Evesham Flood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U09 Land adjacent Fairwater Nursing Home, Coopers Lane. Evesham Flood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U10 Land off Abbey Road Evesham Flood / Planning Permission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U12 Public House, Pershore Road, Hampton. Evesham Built Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U13 Childrens Home at rear of Peewit Road Evesham Planning Permission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U15 End of Hylton Road, hampton Evesham PPG17 / Planning Permission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U17 Bewdley Street Evesham Built Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U21 Land off Cowl Street/ Oat Street Evesham Duplication/ Availability Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U23 Land adjacent Cinema, Port Street. Evesham Flood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U24 Tax Office carpark, Burford Road Evesham Flood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U25 Rear of Lime Street &amp; Northwick Road Evesham Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U31 North of Briar Close Industrial Estate, Worcester Road Evesham ELR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U33 Former Gas Depot, Common Road Evesham Flood/ Planning Permission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U35 Land off A46, Cheltenham Road Junction Evesham Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-U36 Land adjacent to Evesham Road, Norton Evesham Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-08 Land north of A44 Twyford Evesham Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pershore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71-05  landowner and site availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-07  site availability unknown 71-07A - planning consent granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-08  landowner and site availability unknown, Access within Floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-09  Built Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-10  Built Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-11  number not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-12  land adj to Hurst Road Cottages, south of Wyre Road - possible strategic site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-13  landowner and site availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-14  landowner and site availability unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pershore

71-16 landowner and site availability unknown
71-19 landowner and site availability unknown
71-20 possible strategic site
71-21 possible strategic Employment site
71-22 Flood and unknown availability
71-24 planning consent granted for 132 dwellings
71-25 landowner and availability unknown
71-26 availability unknown, wrong side of Wyre Road - adj to Employment and school
71-27 possible strategic site
71-28 possible strategic site
71-29 landowner and availability unknown, also adj to area of arch interest
71-30 landowner and availability unknown
71-31 availability unknown, originally ruled out for possible extension to cemetery
71-34 Duplicated and wrong side of railway
71-35 possible strategic site
71-36 part covered by 71-28 is possible strategic site, remainder too large, too great an impact, too prominent
71-37 possible strategic site
Plum Tree PH, Pershore - Planning application in for 9 dwellings following recent refusal for 10

Category 1 Villages

Badsey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>06-01 PPG17/ Flood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06-05 Ruled out Size / Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-06 Ruled out Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-11 Ruled out Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-17 Ruled out Too removed from village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-18 Ruled out Too removed from village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-20 Ruled out Availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-21 Ruled out Availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-22 Ruled out Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-23 Ruled out Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-24 Ruled out PPS3 / Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-25 Ruled out Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-27 Ruled out Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-28 Ruled out Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-29 Ruled out Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bredon</th>
<th>12-02 Ruled out</th>
<th>PPG17/Unavailable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-03 Ruled out</td>
<td>Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-04 Ruled out</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-05 Not considered as removed from village, submitted as a strategic site for Tewkesbury expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-06 Not considered as removed from village, submitted as a strategic site for Tewkesbury expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-07 Ruled out</td>
<td>Scale / Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-08 Ruled out</td>
<td>Cat 4b (Kinsham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-09 Ruled out</td>
<td>Location / Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-10 Ruled out</td>
<td>Size / PPS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-11 Ruled out</td>
<td>Scale / Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-12 Ruled out</td>
<td>Scale / Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-14 Ruled out</td>
<td>Scale / Location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadway</th>
<th>17-01 Ruled out</th>
<th>Location / AONB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-02 Ruled out</td>
<td>Location / AONB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-03 Ruled out</td>
<td>Location/AONB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-05 Duplicated See 17-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-06 Ruled out</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-07 Ruled out</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-08 Ruled out</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-09 Number not used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-10 Ruled out</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-11 Ruled out</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-12 Number not used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-13 Ruled out</td>
<td>Flood / PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-14 Ruled out</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-15 Ruled out</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-16 Ruled out</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-18 Ruled out</td>
<td>Scale / Dup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-22 Ruled out</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-23 Ruled out</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hartlebury</th>
<th>45-02 Ruled out</th>
<th>Green Beltv/Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-03 Green Belt / Availability Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-06 Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-07</td>
<td>Green Belt/Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-08</td>
<td>Green Belt / Availability Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-09</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-10</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-11</td>
<td>L Green Belt/Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-12</td>
<td>Green Belt/Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-13</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-14</td>
<td>Green Belt / Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-15</td>
<td>Green Belt/Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-16</td>
<td>L Green Belt/ Availability Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-17</td>
<td>Availability Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-18</td>
<td>Green Belt / Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-19</td>
<td>Planning Permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-21</td>
<td>Green Belt/Slope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-22</td>
<td>Green Belt/Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-23</td>
<td>Green Belt/Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-24</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-25</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-26</td>
<td>Green Belt / Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-28</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>51-02</th>
<th>Ruled out Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51-03</td>
<td>Ruled out Flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-04</td>
<td>Ruled out Flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-05</td>
<td>Ruled out Avail unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-07</td>
<td>Ruled out Unviable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-08</td>
<td>Ruled out Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-09</td>
<td>Ruled out Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-12</td>
<td>Ruled out Avail unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-13</td>
<td>Ruled out Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-14</td>
<td>Ruled out Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-15</td>
<td>Ruled out Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-17</td>
<td>Ruled out Size/Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-18</td>
<td>Ruled out PPG 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>53-01</th>
<th>Ruled out Unviable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53-04</td>
<td>Ruled out Availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-08</td>
<td>Ruled out Availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-09</td>
<td>Ruled out Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-10</td>
<td>Ruled out Too Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-11</td>
<td>Ruled out Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inkberrow</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-12</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-13</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-14</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Offenham** |
| 66-01 | Ruled out | Planning Permission |
| 66-02 | Ruled out | Employment |
| 66-03 | Ruled out | Employment |
| 66-05 | Ruled out | Location |
| 66-06 | Ruled out | PPG17 |
| 66-07 | Ruled out | Location |
| 66-09 | Ruled out | Employment/Location |
| 66-11 | Ruled out | Availability unknown |
| 66-12 | Ruled out | Access |
| 66-13 | Ruled out | Community |
| 66-15 | Ruled out | Availability unknown |
| 66-16 | Ruled out | Access unknown |
| 66-17 | Ruled out | Duplicated |
| 66-18 | Ruled out | Location |
| 66-19 | Ruled out | Planning Permission/Small |
| 66-20 | Ruled out | Location |
| 66-21 | Ruled out | Access |
| 66-22 | Ruled out | Duplicated/Availability unknown |
| 66-23 | Ruled out | Location |
| 66-27 | Ruled out | Scale/Location |
| 66-28 | Ruled out | Scale/Location |
| 66-29 | Ruled out | Unviable/Size |

| **Ombersley** |
| 67-03 | Ruled out | Location |
| 67-05 | Ruled out | Built Out |
| 67-06 | Ruled out | Unavailable |
| 67-07 | Ruled out | Unavailable |
| 67-08 | Ruled out | Unavailable |
| 67-09 | Ruled out | Unavailable |
| 67-10 | Ruled out | Availability unknown |
| 67-11 | Ruled out | Unavailable |
| 67-13 | Ruled out | Availability unknown |
| 67-14 | Ruled out | Access |

<p>| <strong>Wychbold</strong> |
| 29wy-05 | Ruled out | Availability unknown (also has planning permission for gym and residential uses) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wychbold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29-wy-06 Ruled out Green Belt/Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29wy-07 Ruled out Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29wy-08 Ruled out Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29wy-09 Ruled out Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29wy-10 Ruled out Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29wy-11 Ruled out Built Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29wy-12 Ruled out Green Belt/Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29wy-13 Ruled out Green Belt/Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29wy-14 Ruled out Green Belt/Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29wy-16 Ruled out Location/Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29wy-17 Ruled out Green Belt/Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29wy-18 Ruled out Green Belt/Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29wy-19 Ruled out Availability unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 2 Villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ashton under Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-02 PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-03 Ownership known but Av unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-04 Ownership known but avail unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-06 Ruled out for too small but ownership known same ownership as 0404 combined with this site could create one site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-07 Location removed from development boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-09 Ownership known but availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-10 Ownership known but availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-12 Location, access, topography</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beckford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-01 Ruled out for location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-03 Ruled out for location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-04 Ruled out for location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-05 Ruled out for location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-06 Ruled out for scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bretforton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-01 Ruled out Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-03 number not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-04 Ruled out Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-06 Ruled out Availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-08 Ruled out PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-10 Ruled out Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-11 Ruled out Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bretforton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croptorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drakes Broughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drakes Broughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernhill Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fladbury
- 38-01 | Ruled out | availability unknown | backland development
- 38-02 | Ruled out | availability unknown
- 38-03 | Availability unknown
- 38-04 | Ruled out | for location / unviable
- 38-05 | Ruled out | for PPG17
- 38-07 | Ruled out | for access/duplicated
- 38-08 | Ruled out | for location
- 38-09 | Ruled out | for scale and duplicated with 3806
- 38-10 | Ruled out | for location and inviable

### Flyford Flavell
- 39-01 | (Ruled out) | Poor Connectivity
- 39-02 | (Ruled out) | Unavailable
- 39-05 | (Ruled out) | Size
- 39-06 | (Ruled out) | Size/Planning Permission
- 39-08 | (Ruled out) | Location
- 39-09 | (Ruled out) | Scale
- 39-11 | (Ruled out) | Scale

### Harvington
- 46-01 | Ruled out | Built Out
- 46-04 | Ruled out | Access
- 46-05 | Ruled out | Location/flood
- 46-06 | Ruled out | Location
- 46-07 | Ruled out | Access
- 46-08 | Ruled out | Location
- 46-09 | Ruled out | Availability Unknown
- 46-10 | Ruled out | Availability Unknown
- 46-13 | Ruled out | Location/Dup
- 46-14 | Ruled out | Built out
- 46-15 | Ruled out | PPG17/Duplicate
- 46-16 | Ruled out | PPG17
- 46-17 | Ruled out | PPG17
- 46-18 | Ruled out | Access
- 46-19 | Ruled out | PPG 17
- 46-21 | Ruled out | Scale

### Pinvin
- 72-01 | employment site and wrong side of A44
- 72-02 | availability unknown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>72-03</th>
<th>availability unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72-04</td>
<td>location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pinvin</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Overbury</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sedgeberrow</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>South Littleton</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Upton Snodsbury

| 84-3 | Ruled out access / Location |
| 84-4 | Ruled out access / Topography / Visual |
| 84-6 | Ruled out Duplicated |
| 84-7 | Ruled out Location |
| 84-8 | Ruled out access |
| 84-9 | Ruled out access |
| 84-13 | Ruled out Access |

### Category 3 Villages

#### Bishampton

| 11-01 | duplicate |
| 11-02 | availability unknown |
| 11-03 | availability unknown |
| 11-04 | duplicate, access issues |
| 11-05 | duplicate |
| 11-07 | availability unknown |
| 11-09 | access |
| 11-10 | scale, access, location |

#### Blackminster

| BL06-02 | Ruled out Scale / Location |

#### Church Lench

| 21-01 | Availability Unknown |
| 21-02 | Size / Viability |
| 21-03 | Legal |
| 21-04 | Ruled out Availability Unknown |

#### Cleeve Prior

<p>| 23-2 | Ruled out Scale |
| 23-3 | Ruled out Scale |
| 23-4 | Ruled out PPG 17 / Access |
| 23-5 | Ruled out Scale / Location |
| 23-6 | Ruled out Access / PPG17 / Duplication |
| 23-8 | Ruled out Location / Access |
| 230-9 | Ruled out Access / Location |
| 23-10 | Ruled out Location |
| 23-11 | Ruled out Availability Unknown |
| 23-12 | Ruled out Availability Unknown |
| 23-13 | Ruled out Wildlife |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23-15</th>
<th>Ruled out</th>
<th>Too Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cleeve Prior</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-16</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-17</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26-01</th>
<th>Ruled out</th>
<th>Availability Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-03</td>
<td>Duplicated (2610 Ruled out Location)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-04</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-05</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-06</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Location/Duplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-07</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-08</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-09</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-11</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Access/Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-13</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-14</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Too removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-15</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-16</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Cat 4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-17</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36c1</th>
<th>Ruled out because in Green Belt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36c2</td>
<td>Ruled out because in Green Belt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27-1</th>
<th>Ruled out</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27-2</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-3</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-8</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-13</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-14</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Location and scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-15</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 35-02 | Ruled out | Access |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44-01</th>
<th>Ruled out</th>
<th>Greenbelt/ Availability Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44-02</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Greenbelt/ Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-05</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Greenbelt/ PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-06</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Greenbelt/ PPG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-07</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
<td>Greenbelt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Himbleton

- 48-05 Ruled out  Too Removed
- 48-07 Ruled out  Location

### Kemerton

- 54-01 Ruled out  Setting/Scale/Unavailable
- 54-02 Ruled out  PPG17/Setting/Unavailable
- 54-04 Ruled out  Location

### Littleworth

- 94-01 Ruled out  PPG17
- 94-02 Ruled out  PPG17

### Lower Moor (Hill & Moor Parish)

- 47-01 landowner and availability unknown
- 47-02 availability unknown, wrong side of railway, nature
- 47-05 landowner and availability unknown
- 47-07 scale, access
- 47-08 landowner and availability unknown
- 47-09 landowner and availability unknown
- 47-11 landowner and availability unknown
- 47-12 landowner and availability unknown
- 47-13 landowner and availability unknown
- 47-14 this site is in Upper Moor (category 4b village)

### Norton Juxta Kempsey

- 64-01 Ruled out  Location
- 64-02 Ruled out  Location
- 64-03 Ruled out  Location
- 64-04 Ruled out  Location
- 64-05 Ruled out  Location
- 64-07 Ruled out  Duplicated
- 64-09 Ruled out  Location
- 64-10 Ruled out  PPG17
- 64-13 Ruled out  Parkway
- 64-14 Too large to be considered for nonstrategic site
- 64-15 Ruled out  Location/Duplicated
- 64-16 Ruled out  Location
- 64-21 Far too removed from settlement submitted as part of strategic submission
- 64-22 Ruled out  Location
- WY63 Ruled out  Scale/Location
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North and Middle Littleton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-1</td>
<td>Ruled out, availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-3</td>
<td>Ruled out, availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pebworth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-02</td>
<td>Ruled out, Availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-08</td>
<td>Ruled out, Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-09</td>
<td>Ruled out, Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-12</td>
<td>Ruled out, Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peopleton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-01</td>
<td>Ruled out, Duplicate and availability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-02</td>
<td>Ruled out, Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-03</td>
<td>Ruled out, Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-04</td>
<td>Ruled out, Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-05</td>
<td>Ruled out, Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-06</td>
<td>Ruled out, Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-07</td>
<td>Ruled out, Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-08</td>
<td>Ruled out, Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stoke Prior</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29-01</td>
<td>Ruled out, Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29-02</td>
<td>Ruled out, Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tibberton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-01</td>
<td>Ruled out, Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-03</td>
<td>Number not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-06</td>
<td>Ruled out, Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-08</td>
<td>Ruled out, PPG17/Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-10</td>
<td>Ruled out, PPG17/Availability Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-11</td>
<td>Ruled out, Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upton Warren</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whittington</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-2</td>
<td>Strategic Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-3</td>
<td>Strategic site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-4</td>
<td>Ruled out, Location / Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-5</td>
<td>Ruled out, Access / Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-6</td>
<td>Ruled out, Duplication / Access / Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-7</td>
<td>Ruled out, Access / Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Annotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-8</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-9</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-10</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-11</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-12</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-13</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-14</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-15</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-16</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-17</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-18</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-19</td>
<td>Ruled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1 Village</td>
<td>Previous Allocations from Local Plan(s) (2001-2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badsey</td>
<td>30 (consent granted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bredon</td>
<td>20 (consent granted for 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlebury</td>
<td>73 (consent granted for 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeybourne</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkberrow</td>
<td>22 (consent granted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenham</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombersley</td>
<td>64 (20 granted consent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wychbold</td>
<td>179 (consent for 51 &amp; 103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2 Village</td>
<td>Previous Allocations from Local Plan(s) (2001-2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton Under Hill</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckford</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bretforton</td>
<td>20 (consent granted for 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropthorne</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drakes Broughton</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckington</td>
<td>20(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernhill Heath</td>
<td>216 (consent for 132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fladbury</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyford Flavell</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvington</td>
<td>20 (consent granted for 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overbury</td>
<td>No stats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinvin</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgeberrow</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Littleton</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2 Village</td>
<td>Previous Allocations from Local Plan(s) (2001-2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton Snodsbury</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 3 Village</th>
<th>Previous Allocations from Local Plan(s) (2001-2010)</th>
<th>Total No. of Units Completed (2001-2010)</th>
<th>Total number of households in parish at 2001</th>
<th>Total Number of households in village at April 2010</th>
<th>Number of houses built 2001 - 2010 as % of village housing stock at April 2001</th>
<th>SWDP Allocation</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishampton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>5.77%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackminster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Marston</td>
<td>No Stats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Lench</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>4.03%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleeve Prior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conderton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossway Green</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowle</td>
<td>50 (consent granted)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutnall Green</td>
<td>No Stats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defford</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmley Castle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>4.23%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanbury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>15.32%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3 Village</td>
<td>Previous Allocations from Local Plan(s) (2001-2010)</td>
<td>Total No. of Units Completed (2001-2010)</td>
<td>Total number of households in parish at 2001</td>
<td>Total Number of households in village at April 2010</td>
<td>Number of houses built 2001 - 2010 as % of village housing stock at April 2001</td>
<td>SWDP Allocation</td>
<td>% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himbleton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemerton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleworth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Moor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and Middle Littleton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Juxta Kempsey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pebworth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>7.17%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peopleton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke Prior</td>
<td>No Stats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibberton</td>
<td>50 (consent granted)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>36.08%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton Warren</td>
<td>No Stats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>