

Appendix Q

Shrewsbury Place Plan Area Site Assessments


Published: August 2020

Site Assessment Process Overview

1. Introduction

- 1.1. To inform the identification of proposed site allocations within the Local Plan Review, Shropshire Council has undertaken a comprehensive Site Assessment process. This site assessment process incorporates the assessment of sites undertaken within the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan, recognising that the Sustainability Appraisal is an integral part of plan making, informing the development of vision, objectives and policies and site allocations.
- 1.2. Figure 1 summarises the key stages of the Site Assessment process undertaken, more detail on each of these stages is then provided:

Figure 1: Site Assessment Process



Site Assessment Process

Stage 1: The Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)

Stage 1 consisted of a strategic screen and review of sites.

Following the completion of the SLAA, further sites were promoted for consideration through the consultation and engagement process. Where possible these sites have been included within Stages 2a, 2b and 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal: Site Assessment process.

Following the completion of the SLAA, further information was achieved through the consultation and engagement process. Where possible this information has been considered within Stages 2a, 2b and 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal: Site Assessment process.

Stage 2a: Sustainability Appraisal

Stage 2a consisted of the assessment of the performance of sites against the objectives identified within the Sustainability Appraisal.

Stage 2b: Screening of Sites

Stage 2b consisted of a screening exercise informed by consideration of a sites availability; size and whether there were obvious physical, heritage or environmental constraints present, based on the strategic assessment undertaken within the SLAA.

Stage 3: Detailed site review

Stage 3 consisted of a proportional and comprehensive assessment of sites informed by the sustainability appraisal and assessments undertaken by Highways; Heritage; Ecology; Trees; and Public Protection Officers; various technical studies, including a Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Study, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Green Belt Assessment/Review where appropriate; consideration of infrastructure requirements and opportunities; consideration of other strategic considerations; and professional judgement.

This stage of assessment was an iterative process.

2. The Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)

- 2.1. Stage 1 of the Site Assessment process was undertaken within the SLAA. This involved a technical and very strategic assessment of the suitability; availability; and achievability (including viability) of land for housing and employment development. It represents a key component of the evidence base supporting the Shropshire Council Local Plan Review.
- 2.2. Please Note: Whilst the SLAA is an important technical document, it does not allocate land for development or include all locations where future housing and employment growth will occur. The SLAA ultimately provides information which will be investigated further through the plan-making process.

Assessing Suitability:

- 2.3. Suitability is the consideration of the appropriateness of a use or mix of uses on a site. However, it is not an assessment of what should or will be allocated / developed on a site. The SLAA includes a very strategic assessment of a site's suitability.
- 2.4. Determination of a site's strategic suitability was undertaken through consideration of numerous factors, including:
 - The site's consistency with the Local Plan.
 - The site's location and surroundings, including proximity to the development boundary/built form.
 - The site's boundaries and the extent to which these boundaries are defensible.
 - Site specific factors, including physical limitations to development, such as:
 - The topography of the site;
 - The site's ground conditions;
 - The ability to access the site;
 - Flood risk to the site or its immediate access;
 - The agricultural land quality of the site;
 - Hazardous risks, pollution or contamination of the site;
 - Whether the site has overhead or underground infrastructure, such as pylons, water/gas pipes and electricity cables which may impact on development/levels of development;
 - Other physical constraints, which may impact on development/levels of development.
 - The potential impact on natural environment assets; heritage assets and geological features on and in proximity of the site*. Including consideration of factors such as:
 - The impact on internationally and nationally designated sites and assets;
 - The impact on important trees and woodland, including ancient woodland; and
 - The impact on public open spaces.
 - Whether the site is located within the Green Belt.
 - Legal covenants affecting the site.
 - Market/industry and community requirements in the area.

**Historic environment assets considered for the purpose of this exercise were: Conservation Areas, Registered Battlefields; World Heritage Sites and their buffers; Scheduled Monuments; Registered Parks and Gardens; and Listed Buildings. Sites were considered to be in proximity of an asset where they were within 300m of the site.*

**Natural environment assets considered for the purpose of this exercise and the distance used to determine where a site was in proximity of an asset were: Trees subject to TPO Protection; (30m); Veteran Trees (30m); Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites (50m); Local Nature Reserves (100m); Local Wildlife Sites (250m); National Nature Reserves (500m); Sites of Special Scientific Interest (500m); Ancient Woodland (500m); Special Areas of Conservation (1km); Special Protection Areas (1km); and Ramsar Sites (1km).*

It is accepted that the identification of these key historic and natural environment assets within a set distance of a site is only a useful starting point for consideration of potential impacts resulting from the development/redevelopment of a site and that a more holistic process is required when determining preferred site allocations. However, the SLAA represents a very strategic site assessment and only the first phase of a wider site assessment process. The selection of proposed allocations will be informed by a more holistic process by which sites are reviewed by relevant service areas to consider potential impacts on all assets.

It should also be noted that as the SLAA is a strategic assessment of individual sites it cannot include sequential/exception considerations and as such sites predominantly in Flood Zones 2 and/or 3 or directly accessed through Flood Zones 2 and/or 3 are not suitable. This applies precautionary principle as detailed information on extent of impact of flood risk on access is not available, the site would only be suitable for development if it is considered necessary (through the sequential and/or exception test), the risk can be mitigated and will not increase risk elsewhere. This consideration cannot be undertaken at the high level and individual site assessment stage.

2.5. Reflecting upon the above factors:

- If following the very strategic assessment of the suitability of a site it was concluded that it has no known constraints or restrictions that would prevent development for a particular use or mix of uses, or these constraints could potentially be suitably overcome through mitigation*, then it was viewed as being **currently suitable – subject to further detailed assessment** for the particular use or mix of uses.
- If following the very strategic assessment of the suitability of a site it was concluded that a site did not currently comply with the Local Plan*, but was located within or in proximity of a settlement potentially considered an appropriate location for sustainable development and was not known to have other constraints or restrictions that would prevent development for a particular use or mix of uses, or any known constraints could potentially be suitably overcome through mitigation**, then it was viewed as being **not currently suitable but future potential – subject to further detailed assessment**.
- If following the very strategic assessment of the suitability of a site it was concluded that a site was subject to known constraints and it was considered that such constraints cannot be suitably overcome through mitigation, then it was viewed as being **not suitable**.
- If following the very strategic assessment of the suitability of a site it was concluded that a site did not currently comply with the Local Plan, and was not located within or in proximity of a settlement potentially considered an appropriate location for sustainable development, then it was viewed as being **not suitable**.

**As this is a very strategic assessment, where sites are currently contrary to Local Plan policy but are located within or in proximity of a settlement potentially considered an appropriate location for sustainable development, no judgement is made about whether such a change to policy would be appropriate, this is the role of the Local Plan Review.*

***As this is a very strategic assessment, where sites are subject to known constraints and it is considered that the constraints present could potentially be suitably overcome through mitigation, further detailed assessment will be required to confirm if such mitigation is effective and the impact of this mitigation on the developable area.*

Assessing Availability:

- 2.6. Availability is the consideration of whether a site is considered available for a particular form of development. National Guidance defines availability as follows: “A site is considered available for development, when, on the best information available (confirmed by the call for sites and information from land owners and legal searches where appropriate), there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems, such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational

requirements of landowners. This will often mean that the land is controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop, or the landowner has expressed an intention to sell”¹.

- 2.7. Within the SLAA, sites were generally considered to be available where they had been actively promoted for the relevant use during:
- The ‘Call for Sites’ exercise;
 - The Local Plan Review; or
 - Preparation of the current Local Plan (Core Strategy and SAMDev Plan).
- 2.8. Or where:
- There has been a recent Planning Application (whether successful or not) for the relevant use; or
 - Officers have particular knowledge about a site’s availability.

Assessing Achievability (including Viability)

- 2.9. As this SLAA is a very strategic assessment, Shropshire Council has used very general assumptions to inform its assessment of the achievability and viability of a site. A more detailed assessment of viability and deliverability will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.

Conclusion

- 2.10. Once the assessment of a site’s development potential; suitability; availability; and achievability (including viability) was undertaken and conclusions reached on each of these categories, an overall conclusion was reached.
- 2.11. Sites were effectively divided into three categories, these were:
- **Rejected sites:**
 - The site is considered unsuitable; and/or
 - The site is considered to be unavailable; and/or
 - The site is considered unachievable/unviable.
 - **Long Term Potential - Subject to Further Detailed Assessment:**
 - The site is considered to be not currently suitable but may have future potential - subject to further detailed assessment; and/or
 - There is uncertainty about the sites availability; and/or
 - There is uncertainty about the sites achievability/viability.
 - **Accepted - Subject to Further Detailed Assessment:**
 - The site is considered currently suitable – subject to further detailed assessment; and
 - The site is considered available; and
 - The site is considered achievable/viable.
- 2.12. Various data sources were used to identify sites for consideration within the SLAA, including existing Local Plan Allocations (including proposals within adopted and emerging Neighbourhood Plans); Planning Application records; Local Authority land ownership records; a ‘Call for Sites’; and sites identified within previous Strategic Housing Land Availability (SHLAA) exercises. Ultimately, around 2,000 sites were considered within the SLAA process.

3. Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

- 3.1. Stage 2a of the Site Assessment process consisted of the analysis of the performance of sites against the Sustainability Objectives identified within the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The Sustainability Appraisal and Site Assessment Environmental Report illustrates how these Sustainability Objectives relate to the SEA Directive and the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

¹ CLG, NPPG – HELAA, Paragraph 020, Reference ID 3-020-20140306, Last updated 06/03/2014

- 3.2. The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report describes how the Sustainability Objectives have been adapted to allow for the sustainability appraisal of sites. Information on implementation and further adaptations in response to practical issues and comments received during the Local Plan preparation process is given in the Sustainability Appraisal and Site Assessment Environmental Report. The aim throughout was to ensure the allocation of the most sustainable sites and where a less sustainable option was chosen for valid and justifiable planning reasons, to suggest mitigation measures to offset any identified significant negative impact.
- 3.3. The Sustainability Appraisal scoring system was adapted for the Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal to allow for clear comparisons between the sustainability of several sites in the same vicinity. The scoring system also needed to provide a relatively straightforward result. Accordingly, it used the same positive, neutral and negative nomenclature as that for the Sustainability Appraisal of the options and policies. It differed however, in that each criterion is scored from only two options. These options varied between criteria to better reflect the purpose of Sustainability Appraisal.
- 3.4. The identified criteria and scoring system were translated into a matrix, to assess sites. The scoring was then colour coded to assist with interpretation as follows:

| | |
|----|--|
| -- | |
| - | |
| 0 | |
| + | |

- 2.23 Sites were assessed on a settlement by settlement basis e.g. all sites in Albrighton were assessed against each other. This was felt to be the best way of using the Sustainability Appraisal as it is intended – namely to evaluate options (in this case all the sites promoted for development in each settlement) and use the outcomes to inform the site selection process for the Local Plan. All sites from the SLAA were assessed for each settlement and most of the assessment was carried out using GIS to populate the excel spreadsheet. Manual recording was used for those few instances where data was not available e.g. when a site was promoted after the data had already been exported from the GIS.
- 2.24 Once the Sustainability Appraisal matrix was complete, the negative and positive marks for each site were combined to give a numerical value. The lowest and highest values for that settlement were then used to determine a range. The range was then divided into three equal parts. Where three equal parts were not possible (for instance in a range of -8 to +4 = 13 points) the largest part was assigned to the higher end of the range (for instance -8 to -5 = 4 points, then -4 to -1 = 4 points and lastly 0 to +4 = 5 points). This was based on the assumption that there are likely to be more negative than positive scores.
- 2.25 Those sites in the lowest third of the range were rated as Poor, those in the middle third as Fair and those in the upper third as Good. A Poor rating was deemed to be the equivalent of significantly negative.
- 2.26 Completed matrices for each settlement are provided within Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal of this Appendix.

4. Screening of Sites

- 4.1. Stage 2b of the Site Assessment process involved screening of identified sites. This screen was informed by consideration of a sites availability, size and whether there were obvious physical, heritage or environmental constraints present, based on the strategic assessment undertaken within the SLAA.

4.2. Specifically, sites did not proceed to Stage 3 of the site assessment process where:

- **There is uncertainty about whether the site is available for relevant forms of development.** A site is generally considered to be available where they have been actively promoted for residential or mixed-use development during the preparation of the current Local Plan (Core Strategy and SAMDev Plan); during the most recent 'call for sites'; or during the ongoing Local Plan Review. It is also considered to be available for residential development where there has been a recent Planning Application for residential or mixed-use development on the site (whether successful or not); or where officers have particular knowledge about a sites availability.

Where relevant, a site is considered to be available for employment development where it has been actively promoted for employment or mixed-use development during the preparation of the current Local Plan (Core Strategy and SAMDev Plan); during the most recent 'call for sites'; or during the ongoing Local Plan Review. It is also considered to be available for employment development where there has been a recent Planning Application for employment or mixed-use development on the site (whether successful or not); or where officers have particular knowledge about a sites availability.

- **The site is less than a specified site size (unless there is potential for allocation as part of a wider site).** These site sizes are:
 - 0.2ha for Community Hubs (generally, sites of less than 0.2ha are unlikely to achieve 5 or more dwellings).
 - 0.2ha for Strategic/Principal/Key Centres within/partly within the Green Belt or Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (generally, sites of less than 0.2ha are unlikely to achieve 5 or more dwellings).
 - 0.5ha for other Strategic/Principal/Key Centres.
- **The strategic assessment of the site has identified a significant physical*, heritage** and/or environmental** constraint identified within the strategic assessment of sites undertaken within the SLAA.**

**Significant physical constraints:*

1. *Where all or the majority of a site is located within Flood Zone 2 and/or 3 such that the site is considered undeliverable, it will not be 'screened out'. This is consistent with NPPF. Where a site can only be accessed through Flood Zones 2 and/or 3 this will be subject to detailed consideration within Stage 3 of the site assessment process. The preference would be to avoid (sequential approach) such site, however in circumstances where other constraints mean that a site with access through Flood Zones 2 and/or 3 is preferred for allocation, detailed assessment of the implications for an access through Flood Zone will be considered within Level 2 of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. This distinction recognises the different approach taken within the NPPF and NPPG with regard to site suitability when located within Flood Zone 2 and/or 3 and establishing safe access through Flood Zone 2 and/or 3.*
2. *The majority of the site contains an identified open space.*
3. *The site can only be accessed through an identified open space.*
4. *The topography of the site is such that development could not occur (this has been very cautiously applied).*
5. *The site is separated from the built form of the settlement (unless the land separating the site from the built form is also promoted and will progress through this screening).*
6. *The site is landlocked/does not have a road frontage (unless another promoted site will progress through this screening and could provide the site a road frontage for this site).*
7. *The site is more closely associated with the built form of an alternative settlement*

***Significant natural environment/heritage constraints:*

1. *The majority of the site has been identified as a heritage asset. Historic environment assets considered for the purpose of this exercise were: Conservation Areas, Registered Battlefields; World Heritage Sites and their buffers; Scheduled Monuments; Registered Parks and Gardens; and Listed Buildings. We acknowledge that there is no distinction*

between direct impact on a heritage asset and impact on the setting of a heritage asset. However, this is an issue along with archaeological potential which requires specialist advice; this forms part of Stage 3 of the site assessment process.

2. The majority of the site has been identified as a natural environment asset. Natural environment assets considered for the purpose of this exercise were: Trees subject to TPO Protection; Veteran Trees; Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites; Local Nature Reserves; Local Wildlife Sites; National Nature Reserves; Sites of Special Scientific Interest; Ancient Woodland; Special Areas of Conservation; Special Protection Areas; and Ramsar Sites.

Please Note:

Within the assessment, commentary is provided about the sites strategic suitability where a site was rejected within the SLAA.

Where a site met one or more of these criteria, the relevant criteria is highlighted within the assessment.

5. Detailed Site Review

5.1. Stage 3 of the Site Assessment process considered those sites which were not 'screened out' of the assessment at Stage 2b. It involved a detailed review of sites and selection of proposed site allocations. This stage was informed by:

- The results of Stage 1 of the Site Assessment process (which informs the assessment of sites).
- The results of Stage 2a of the Site Assessment process (which informs the assessment of sites).
- The results of Stage 2b of the Site Assessment process (which informs the site assessed).
- Assessments undertaken by Highways*; Heritage; Ecology; Tree; and Public Protection Officers. In undertaking detailed reviews of sites within stage 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal: Site Assessment process, officers considered best available evidence**, where necessary undertook site visits and applied professional judgement in order to provide commentary on each site.

**The Highways Assessment included access to services for the Strategic, Principal and Key Centres, reflecting that these settlements are generally much larger than Community Hubs.*

***It should be noted that whilst the service area reviews were informed by the assessment of assets on and within proximity of the site undertaken within the SLAA process, they were not limited to consideration of these assets. The review was holistic in nature and in many instances identified additional assets which had not previously been identified. The commentary provided by the relevant service areas included a proportionate summary of:*

- *The value/significance of any identified assets.*
- *The relationship between the site and any identified assets.*
- *Potential impact on any identified assets resulting from development / redevelopment of the site.*
- *If relevant, potential mechanisms for mitigating impact and/or recommendations on further assessment(s) required if the site is identified for allocation to inform the future development of the site.*

- Commissioned evidence base studies, including a Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Study; Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment; and Green Belt Review.
- A Habitats Regulations Assessment.
- Consideration of infrastructure requirements and opportunities.
- Other strategic considerations* and professional judgement.

**Access through Flood Zones 2 and/or 3 was given due consideration within Stage 3 of the site assessment. In circumstances where consideration of other constraints resulted in the identification of a preferred site which relies on access through Flood Zone 2 and/or 3, the ability to achieve safe access and egress was considered through a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Only where the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment indicated that safe access and egress could be established has such a site been identified as a proposed site allocation.*

5.2. This stage of assessment was an iterative process.

- 5.3. Once initial conclusions are reached within Stage 3 of the Site Assessment process, these were evaluated through Stage 2a of the site assessment process before proposals were finalised.

**Shrewsbury Place Plan Area
Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:
Site Assessments**

Strategic Centre: Shrewsbury

Stage 2a Residential

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | BES001X | BES002 | BES003 | BIT026 | GVH001X | SHR001X | SHR002 | SHR003 | SHR004 | SHR005 | SHR006 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | + | - | + | |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | + | |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | + | |
| | Children's playground | | - | - | - | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | + | - | - | + | - | + | + | + | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | + | - | - | + | + | - | + | + | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | - | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | + | + | + | + | + | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -11 | -11 | -2 | -5 | -13 | 2 | -3 | 0 | -1 | -7 | 0 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Poor | Poor | Fair | Fair | Poor | Good | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Good |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR007 | SHR008 | SHR011 | SHR012 | SHR014 | SHR015 | SHR016 | SHR019 | SHR020 | SHR021X | SHR022X | SHR023 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | - | - | + | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | + | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Amenity green space | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | - | + | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 |
| 100m of a Listed Building | - | | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | - | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | + | + | + | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 2 | -3 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 0 | -6 | -1 | -3 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Fair | Good | Fair |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR025 | SHR026 | SHR027 | SHR031 | SHR032 | SHR033X | SHR035 | SHR036X | SHR037 | SHR038 | SHR039X | SHR040 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | + | - | + | + |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | + | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | - | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | + | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | + | + | - | + | - | + | - | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | - | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | + | | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -11 | -9 | -13 | -9 | -5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | -2 | 0 | -2 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Fair |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | SHR041X | SHR042 | SHR043X | SHR044 | SHR046 | SHR053 | SHR054a | SHR054b | SHR054c | SHR055 | SHR056 | SHR057 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | + |
| | GP surgery | | + | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | + | - | + |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | - | - | + |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | - | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | - | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | - | + | + | - | + | - | - | - | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | - | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | - | | - | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | + | + | | | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -3 | -7 | 3 | -9 | -11 | -1 | -2 | -7 | -7 | -4 | -9 | -2 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Fair | Good | Poor | Poor | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Poor | Fair |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR058 | SHR059X | SHR060 | SHR063 | SHR064 | SHR065 | SHR066 | SHR067 | SHR074 | SHR075X | SHR076 | SHR077 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | + | - | + | + |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | + |
| | Children's playground | | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Amenity green space | + | | + | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | -- | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | - | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | - | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | + | | | + | + | + | + | + |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -11 | -7 | -2 | -3 | -2 | -7 | -3 | 1 | 1 | -1 | -3 | 1 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Poor | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Good |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| | | | SHR080 | SHR081 | SHR083 | SHR084 | SHR085 | SHR086 | SHR088 | SHR090X | SHR093 | SHR096 | SHR099 | SHR100 | |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | + | - | + | - | - | - | + | + | - | |
| | GP surgery | | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | + | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | - | - | - | + | - | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | - | + | - | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -3 | -6 | -1 | 1 | -5 | 2 | -1 | -2 | -1 | -4 | -4 | -11 | |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Fair | Fair | Good | Fair | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Poor | |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| | | | SHR101X | SHR103 | SHR104 | SHR105 | SHR106 | SHR109 | SHR110 | SHR111 | SHR115 | SHR116 | SHR117 | SHR120 | |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Leisure centre | | - | + | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | - | + | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | + | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | + | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | - | | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | - | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | | | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | + | | + | + | | | | + | + | + | + | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -3 | 5 | -9 | -5 | -7 | -8 | -5 | -8 | -7 | -7 | -3 | 1 | |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Good | Poor | Fair | Good | |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | SHR121 | SHR123 | SHR124X | SHR126 | SHR127 | SHR131 | SHR132 | SHR134 | SHR137X | SHR138X | SHR139 | SHR140 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | - | + | + | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | - | | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | 0 | -2 | -1 | -1 | 3 | 2 | -4 | -3 | -1 | -3 | 3 | -8 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Fair | Good | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Good | Fair |

Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR141X | SHR142 | SHR143X | SHR144X | SHR145 | SHR146 | SHR147 | SHR148 | SHR149 | SHR150 | SHR154 | SHR157 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | + | + | - |
| | GP surgery | | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | - | + | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | - |
| | Amenity green space | | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | - | - |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | - | - | + | + | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | - |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | -- | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | | | + | | + | + | + | | + | + | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -1 | -10 | -11 | -4 | -2 | 0 | 0 | -6 | -12 | -1 | -6 | -12 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Poor | Poor | Fair | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Poor | Good | Fair | Poor |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR157VAR | SHR158 | SHR159 | SHR160 | SHR161 | SHR162 | SHR163 | SHR164 | SHR165 | SHR166 | SHR167 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | - | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | - | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -9 | -8 | -1 | -13 | -4 | -4 | -4 | -6 | -5 | -6 | -4 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Poor | Fair | Good | Poor | Fair |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR169 | SHR170 | SHR171 | SHR172 | SHR173 | SHR174 | SHR175 | SHR176 | SHR177 | SHR178 | SHR179 | SHR180 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -6 | -4 | -4 | -3 | -4 | -4 | -3 | -6 | -4 | -3 | -4 | -4 |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 | | | Fair |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| | | | SHR181 | SHR182 | SHR183 | SHR184x | SHR185 | SHR186 | SHR187 | SHR188 | SHR189 | SHR190 | SHR191 | SHR192 | |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | - | + | + | - | - | + | + | - | - | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -4 | -4 | -3 | -5 | -4 | -4 | -6 | -6 | -4 | -4 | -6 | -6 | |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 | | | Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR193 | SHR194 | SHR195 | SHR196 | SHR197 | SHR197VAR | SHR198 | SHR199 | SHR200 | SHR201 | SHR203 | SHR204 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | - | + | - | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -6 | -6 | -4 | -6 | -4 | -4 | -6 | -6 | -4 | -6 | -4 | -4 |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 | | | Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR205 | SHR206 | SHR207 | SHR208 | SHR209 | SHR210 | SHR211 | SHR212 | SHR213 | SHR215 | SHR216 | SHR217 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | + | - | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -6 | -4 | -4 | -6 | -6 | -4 | -6 | -6 | -6 | -6 | -4 | -5 |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR218 | SHR219 | SHR221 | SLC002 | SLC003 | UFF001 | UFF002 | UFF003X | UFF004 | UFF005 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -6 | -4 | -4 | -5 | -5 | -6 | -6 | -6 | -6 | -6 |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| | | | UFF007 | UFF008 | SHR057 & SHR177 | SHR060, SHR158 & SHR161 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | Yes = double minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | |
| | Primary School | | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | Yes = plus score (+) | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | - | + |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | Yes = double minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 100m of a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -6 | -6 | -4 | -5 |
| Range is 6 to -15 Good is 6 to -1 Fair is -2 to -8 Poor is -9 to -15 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair |

Strategic Centre: Shrewsbury

Stage 2a Employment

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | BES001X | BES002 | BES003 | BIT026 | GVH001X | SHR001X | SHR002 | SHR003 | SHR004 | SHR005 | SHR006 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | + | - | - | + |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | + | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | + | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | + | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | + | - | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | + |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | -- | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | + | + | + | + | + |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -9 | -9 | 0 | -5 | -12 | 0 | -3 | 0 | -1 | -7 | 0 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Poor | Poor | Good | Fair | Poor | Good | Fair | Good | Fair | Poor | Good |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR007 | SHR008 | SHR011 | SHR012 | SHR014 | SHR015 | SHR016 | SHR019 | SHR020 | SHR021X | SHR022X | SHR023 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | - | - | + | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | - | + | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 |
| 100m of a Listed Building | - | | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | - | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | + | + | + | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | -3 | -2 | 3 | -4 | 0 | -6 | -3 | -3 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Good | Fair | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR025 | SHR026 | SHR027 | SHR031 | SHR032 | SHR033X | SHR035 | SHR036X | SHR037 | SHR038 | SHR039X | SHR040 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | + | - | + | + |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | + | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | - | + | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | - | | + | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | + | + | - | + | - | + | - | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| 100m of a Listed Building | - | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | + | | + | + | + | + | + |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -9 | -8 | -11 | -7 | -5 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | -2 | 2 | -2 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Fair | Fair | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Fair |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | SHR041X | SHR042 | SHR043X | SHR044 | SHR046 | SHR053 | SHR054a | SHR054b | SHR054c | SHR055 | SHR056 | SHR057 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | + |
| | GP surgery | | + | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | + | + |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | - | - | + |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | - | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | - | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | - | + | + | - | + | - | - | - | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | - | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | -- | -- | -- | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | + | + | | | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -3 | -6 | 3 | -7 | -9 | -1 | -3 | -7 | -6 | -2 | -7 | -2 |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Fair | Good | Poor | Poor | Fair | Fair | Poor | Fair | Fair | Poor | Fair |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR058 | SHR059X | SHR060 | SHR063 | SHR064 | SHR065 | SHR066 | SHR067 | SHR074 | SHR075X | SHR076 | SHR077 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | + | - | + | + |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 |
| a Listed Building | -- | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 100m of a Listed Building | - | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | -- | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | + | | | + | + | + | + | + |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -9 | -5 | -2 | -3 | -2 | -8 | -3 | -1 | 1 | -1 | -3 | 1 |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Poor | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Poor | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Good |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | SHR080 | SHR081 | SHR083 | SHR084 | SHR085 | SHR086 | SHR088 | SHR090X | SHR093 | SHR096 | SHR099 | SHR100 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | + | - | + | - | - | - | + | + | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | + | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | - | + | - | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | + |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | -- | -- |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -1 | -6 | 1 | 1 | -3 | 2 | 1 | -2 | -1 | -4 | -5 | -10 |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Poor |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | SHR101X | SHR103 | SHR104 | SHR105 | SHR106 | SHR109 | SHR110 | SHR111 | SHR115 | SHR116 | SHR117 | SHR120 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | + | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | + |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | - | | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | - | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | + | | + | + | | | | + | + | + | + |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -3 | 5 | -7 | -5 | -5 | -8 | -3 | -7 | -5 | -5 | -1 | 1 |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Good | Poor | Fair | Fair | Poor | Fair | Poor | Fair | Fair | Fair | Good |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | SHR121 | SHR123 | SHR124X | SHR126 | SHR127 | SHR131 | SHR132 | SHR134 | SHR137X | SHR138X | SHR139 | SHR140 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | + | + |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | + | - | + | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | - | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | + |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | -- |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| 100m of a Listed Building | - | | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | 0 | -2 | -2 | -1 | 3 | 2 | -6 | -5 | -1 | -5 | 3 | -8 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Good | Poor |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | SHR141X | SHR142 | SHR143X | SHR144X | SHR145 | SHR146 | SHR147 | SHR148 | SHR149 | SHR150 | SHR154 | SHR157 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | + | + | - |
| | GP surgery | | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | - |
| | Amenity green space | | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | - | - |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | - | - | + | + | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | - |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | -- | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | | + | + | | + | + | + | | + | + | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -1 | -8 | -8 | -3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -4 | -10 | -1 | -4 | -10 |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Poor | Fair | Fair | Poor |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR157VAR | SHR158 | SHR159 | SHR160 | SHR161 | SHR162 | SHR163 | SHR164 | SHR165 | SHR166 | SHR167 | SHR168 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Amenity green space | | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | -- | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | | | | - | | - | | - | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | + | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -9 | -6 | -1 | -11 | -4 | -5 | -4 | -7 | -4 | -7 | -5 | -6 |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Poor | Fair | Fair | Poor | Fair | Fair | Fair | Poor | Fair | Poor | Fair | Fair |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR169 | SHR170 | SHR171 | SHR172 | SHR173 | SHR174 | SHR175 | SHR176 | SHR177 | SHR178 | SHR179 | SHR180 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | -- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | - | | | | | - | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | + | | | + | | | + | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -8 | -5 | -4 | -2 | -4 | -4 | -2 | -7 | -4 | -2 | -4 | -4 |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Poor | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Poor | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR181 | SHR182 | SHR183 | SHR184x | SHR185 | SHR186 | SHR187 | SHR188 | SHR189 | SHR190 | SHR191 | SHR192 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | - | + | + | - | - | + | + | - | - |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | + | + | | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -4 | -4 | -2 | -4 | -4 | -4 | -6 | -6 | -4 | -4 | -6 | -6 |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR193 | SHR194 | SHR195 | SHR196 | SHR197 | SHR197VAR | SHR198 | SHR199 | SHR200 | SHR201 | SHR203 | SHR204 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | - | + | - | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | + | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -6 | -6 | -4 | -6 | -4 | -4 | -6 | -7 | -4 | -6 | -3 | -4 |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Poor | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR205 | SHR206 | SHR207 | SHR208 | SHR209 | SHR210 | SHR211 | SHR212 | SHR213 | SHR215 | SHR216 | SHR217 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | + | - |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | + | | | + | | | | | + |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -6 | -4 | -4 | -5 | -6 | -4 | -5 | -6 | -8 | -6 | -5 | -4 |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Poor | Fair | Fair | Fair |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | SHR218 | SHR219 | SHR221 | SLC002 | SLC003 | UFF001 | UFF002 | UFF003X | UFF004 | UFF005 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -6 | -4 | -4 | -5 | -5 | -6 | -6 | -6 | -6 | -6 |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| | | | UFF007 | UFF008 | SHR060, SHR158 & SHR161 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | Yes = double minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | Children's playground | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | Primary School | | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | Yes = plus score (+) | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | No = minus score (-) | - | - | + |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | + | + | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | Yes = double minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | -- | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 100m of a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | - |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score (-) | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment | Minus score (-) | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -6 | -6 | -5 |
| Range is 5 to -12 Good is 5 to 0 Fair is -1 to -6 Poor is -7 to -12 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Fair | Fair |

Community Hub: Baschurch

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: BNP003 | Site Ref: BNP005 | Site Ref: BNP006 | Site Ref: BNP007 | Site Ref: BNP008 | Site Ref: BNP009 | Site Ref: BNP010 | Site Ref: BNP011 | Site Ref: BNP012 | Site Ref: BNP014 | Site Ref: BNP017 | Site Ref: BNP021 | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | - | + | + | + | |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | + | - | + | + | + | - | - | - | |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | - | + | + | + | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 300m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | + | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -2 | -2 | -3 | -2 | 0 | -6 | -6 | -5 | -6 | -2 | -3 | -2 | |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Good | Poor | Poor | Fair | Poor | Good | Fair | Good | |
| Range is 0 to -8 Good is 0 to -2 Fair is -3 to -5 Poor is -6 to -8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| | | | BNP022 | BNP023 | BNP024 | BNP030X | BNP031X | BNP033 | BNP034a | BNP035 | BNP036 | BNP037 | BNP037VAR | BNP038 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | - | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | |
| | GP surgery | | - | + | + | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | + | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | + | | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -2 | 0 | -2 | -2 | -8 | -6 | -5 | -4 | -8 | -8 | -7 | -6 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Good | Good | Good | Poor | Poor | Fair | Fair | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor |
| Range is 0 to -8 Good is 0 to -2 Fair is -3 to -5 Poor is -6 to -8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | BNP039 | BNP040 | BNP041 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (--) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | + |
| | GP surgery | | + | + | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + |
| Amenity green space | - | | - | - | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | + | - | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | + | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (--) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | -- | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | - | - |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | - | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (--) | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -5 | -5 | -6 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Fair | Poor |
| Range is 0 to -8 Good is 0 to -2 Fair is -3 to -5 Poor is -6 to -8 | | | | | |

Community Hub: Bayston Hill

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: BAY001 | Site Ref: BAY002 | Site Ref: BAY003 | Site Ref: BAY005 | Site Ref: BAY006 | Site Ref: BAY008 | Site Ref: BAY009 | Site Ref: BAY010 | Site Ref: BAY011 | Site Ref: BAY013 | Site Ref: BAY015X | Site Ref: BAY017 | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | + | |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | + | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | - | - | + | + | - | + | - | + | + | + | + | - | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | + | + | - | + | - | + | + | + | - | - | + |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | - | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | - | - | + | - | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | - | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -8 | -8 | -6 | -4 | -8 | -1 | -8 | 2 | 0 | -4 | -10 | -3 | |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Good | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Poor | Good | |
| Range is 2 to -13 Good is 2 to -3 Fair is -4 to -8 Poor is -9 to -13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | BAY018X | BAY019 | BAY022 | BAY023 | BAY024X | BAY025 | BAY026 | BAY027 | BAY029 | BAY030 | BAY032 | BAY033 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | - | + | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | - | + | - | - | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | - | + | - | - | + |
| Amenity green space | + | | + | - | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | - | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 300m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | 0 | 1 | 0 | -7 | -10 | -3 | 2 | -13 | -4 | -12 | -8 | -5 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Poor | Good | Good | Poor | Fair | Poor | Fair | Fair |
| Range is 2 to -13 Good is 2 to -3 Fair is -4 to -8 Poor is -9 to -13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | BAY035 | BAY036 | BAY037 | BAY038 | BAY039 | BAY040 | BAY041 | BAY042 | BAY043 | BAY044 | BAY045 | BAY046 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | + | + | - | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | + | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | + | - | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | - | + | + | + | - | + | - | + | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | + | | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | + | - | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 300m of a Listed Building | 0 | | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -2 | 2 | -9 | -9 | -4 | -3 | -5 | -3 | -13 | -3 | -7 | -6 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Good | Poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Fair | Good | Poor | Good | Fair | Fair |
| Range is 2 to -13 Good is 2 to -3 Fair is -4 to -8 Poor is -9 to -13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: BAY047 | Site Ref: BAY048 | Site Ref: BAY048VAR | Site Ref: BAY049 | Site Ref: BAY050 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | + |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | + |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | + | + | - | + |
| | Amenity green space | | - | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | - | - | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 300m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | + |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -11 | -6 | -6 | -8 | -1 |
| Range is 2 to -13 Good is 2 to -3 Fair is -4 to -8 Poor is -9 to -13 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Poor | Fair | Fair | Fair | Good |

Community Hub: Bicton

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| | | | BIT001 | BIT002 | BIT006 | BIT009 | BIT010 | BIT011X | BIT013 | BIT014 | BIT015 | BIT018X | BIT019X | BIT020 | |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | - | - | - | |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | - | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | + | | | | | + | + | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -13 | -4 | -5 | -6 | -3 | -10 | -5 | -4 | -9 | -12 | -11 | -12 | |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Poor | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Poor | Good | Good | Fair | Poor | Poor | Poor | |
| Range is -1 to -13 Good is -1 to -5 Fair is -6 to -9 Poor is -10 to -13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|
| | | | BIT021 | BIT022 | BIT023 | BIT024 | BIT025 | BIT026 | BIT027 | BIT028 | BIT029 | BIT030 | BIT031 | BIT032 | |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | + | - | + | |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | - | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | - | + |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | + | - | + | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -5 | -5 | -6 | -12 | -12 | -5 | -8 | -10 | -11 | -5 | -13 | -2 | |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Good | Fair | Poor | Poor | Good | Fair | Poor | Poor | Good | Poor | Good | |
| Range is -1 to -13 Good is -1 to -5 Fair is -6 to -9 Poor is -10 to -13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: BIT033 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + |
| | GP surgery | | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | + |
| | Leisure centre | | - |
| | Children's playground | | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + |
| | Amenity green space | | - |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 |
| 300m of a Listed Building | 0 | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -1 |
| Range is -1 to -13 Good is -1 to -5 Fair is -6 to -9 Poor is -10 to -13 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good |

Community Hub: Bomere Heath

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: BOM002 | Site Ref: BOM003 | Site Ref: BOM004 | Site Ref: BOM006 | Site Ref: BOM007X | Site Ref: BOM008 | Site Ref: BOM010 | Site Ref: BOM012 | Site Ref: BOM013 | Site Ref: BOM014 | Site Ref: BOM015 | Site Ref: BOM016 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | - | + | + | - | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 300m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | + | | | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | 0 | -2 | -2 | 0 | -4 | -7 | -4 | 0 | -6 | 0 | 0 | -1 | |
| Range is 0 to -8 Good is 0 to -2 Fair is -3 to -5 Poor is -6 to -8 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Poor | Fair | Good | Poor | Good | Good | Good | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | BOM017 | BOM019 | BOM020 | BOM021 | BOM022 | BOM023 | BOM024 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + | + | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | - | + | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | - | + | + | + | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | + | + | - |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 300m of a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -1 | 0 | -2 | -5 | -3 | -5 | -8 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Poor |
| Range is 0 to -8 Good is 0 to -2 Fair is -3 to -5 Poor is -6 to -8 | | | | | | | | | |

Community Hub: Cross Houses

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | CSH001 | CSH003 | CSH004 | CSH005 | CSH006 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | - | + | - | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | + | - | - | + |
| Amenity green space | + | | + | + | + | + | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | 0 | + | + | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | 0 | - | - | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | + |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -7 | -3 | -7 | -5 | -2 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion (Number of sites is too small to enable robust conclusion on Good/Fair/Poor rating) | | | -7 | -3 | -7 | -5 | -2 |

Community Hub: Dorrington

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: DGN001X | Site Ref: DGN002 | Site Ref: DGN003 | Site Ref: DGN004 | Site Ref: DGN006X | Site Ref: DGN007 | Site Ref: DGN008X | Site Ref: DGN013X | Site Ref: DGN014 | Site Ref: DGN015 | Site Ref: DGN016 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | + | + | + | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -3 | -5 | -3 | -6 | -3 | -3 | -1 | -2 | -13 | -5 | -4 | |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Good | Good | Good | Poor | Good | Good | |
| Range is -1 to -13 Good is -1 to -5 Fair is -6 to -9 Poor is -10 to -13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | DGN017 | DGN018 | DGN019 | DGN020 | DGN021 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | + |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | - | - | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | - | - | - | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -3 | -4 | -4 | -4 | -5 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good |
| Range is -1 to -13 Good is -1 to -5 Fair is -6 to -9 Poor is -10 to -13 | | | | | | | |

Community Hub: Ford

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: FRD001 | Site Ref: FRD002X | Site Ref: FRD003X | Site Ref: FRD004 | Site Ref: FRD005 | Site Ref: FRD006X | Site Ref: FRD007 | Site Ref: FRD009 | Site Ref: FRD011 | Site Ref: FRD012 | Site Ref: FRD013 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | - | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | + | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | + | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | - |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | - | - | - | + | - | - | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | -- | 0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | -- |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | + | | | | + | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -7 | -1 | -3 | -7 | -7 | -3 | -9 | -10 | -4 | 0 | -15 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Good | Fair | Fair | Good | Good | Poor |
| Range is 0 to -15 Good is 0 to -5 Fair is -6 to -10 Poor is -11 to -15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | FRD014 | FRD015X | FRD016 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | - |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | - | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | - | + |
| Amenity green space | + | | - | - | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | - | - | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | - | - |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | + | 0 | + |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | -- | 0 | -- |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | 0 | - |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | 0 | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (--) | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -5 | -11 | -11 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Good | Poor | Poor |
| Range is 0 to -15 Good is 0 to -5 Fair is -6 to -10 Poor is -11 to -15 | | | | | |

Community Hub: Hanwood

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | HWD001X | HWD002 | HWD003 | HWD004 | HWD005 | HWB001X | HWB003 | HWB004 | HWB006 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | + | - | - | + | - |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | + | | | | | + | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -4 | -1 | -2 | -2 | -1 | -6 | -7 | -3 | -6 |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | -4 | -1 | -2 | -2 | -1 | -6 | -7 | -3 | -6 |
| (Number of sites is too small to enable robust conclusion on Good/Fair/Poor rating) | | | | | | | | | | | |

Community Hub: Longden

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: LGN002 | Site Ref: LGN003 | Site Ref: LGN005 | Site Ref: LGN006 | Site Ref: LGN007 | Site Ref: LGN008 | Site Ref: LGN009 | Site Ref: LGN011 | Site Ref: LGN012 | Site Ref: LGN013 | Site Ref: LGN014 | Site Ref: LGN015 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -4 | -4 | -3 | -2 | -4 | -4 | -4 | -4 | -5 | -4 | -4 | -4 | |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Poor | Fair | Fair | Fair | |
| Range is -2 to -5 Good is -2 to -3 Fair is -4 Poor is -5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | LGN016 | LGN017 | LGN018 | LGN019 | LGN020 |
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | - | - | - | + |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | + | + | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | + | + | + | + | + |
| Amenity green space | - | | - | - | - | - | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | - | - | - | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -3 |
| Range is -2 to -5 Good is -2 to -3 Fair is -4 Poor is -5 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Good |

Community Hub: Nesscliffe

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: NES001 | Site Ref: NES002 | Site Ref: NES003 | Site Ref: NES005 | Site Ref: NES007 | Site Ref: NES009X | Site Ref: NES011 | Site Ref: NES012 | Site Ref: NES013 | Site Ref: NES014 | Site Ref: NES015 | Site Ref: NES016 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (--) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - | + | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | - | + | |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | - | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | - | + |
| | Amenity green space | | - | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | - | + | + | - | + |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (--) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 300m of a Listed Building | - | | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (--) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -12 | -11 | -5 | -5 | -7 | -8 | -7 | -10 | -3 | -6 | -11 | -4 | |
| Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Poor | Poor | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Poor | Good | Good | Poor | Good | |
| Range is -3 to -12 Good is -3 to -6 Fair is -7 to -9 Poor is -10 to -12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: NES017 | Site Ref: NES018 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 |
| Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | |
| 2 | Site boundary within buffer zone¹ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | - |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | 0 | | 0 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | - |
| 4 | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following² (record all that apply): | | | |
| | Children's playground | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | | 0 | 0 |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 0 | | 0 | |
| 5 | Site boundary within 480m³ of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | |
| | Primary School | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | | - | - |
| | Children's playground | | + | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | - | - |
| Amenity green space | - | | + | |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | - | | |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-) | + | + |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 |
| a Listed Building | 0 | | 0 | |
| 14 | Site boundary within buffer zone⁵ of one or more (record all that apply): | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | - |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 |
| 300m of a Listed Building | 0 | | - | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score (-) | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded | | | | |
| Overall Score | | | -9 | -11 |
| Range is -3 to -12 Good is -3 to -6 Fair is -7 to -9 Poor is -10 to -12 Overall Sustainability Conclusion | | | Fair | Poor |

Shrewsbury Place Plan Area
Stage 2b Screening of Sites:
Site Assessments

Strategic Centre: Shrewsbury

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY009 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | North of allotments, east of Hereford Road, Bayston Hill |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bayston Hill |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 16.14 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 484 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | This site lies to the south of the A5 and immediately to the east of the A49 extending as far as Sharpstone Lane. The land is flat in character and used for agricultural purposes. A stream flows through the site, as such approximately 25% of the site falls into Flood Zones 2&3. This isolates an area to the east of the site of approx. 2.6 ha of land away from the remainder (approx. 9.5ha) of the site's land not affected by Flood Zone. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | The site is bounded to the west by the A49 on the other side of which is a service station for the A5/A49, garden centre and agricultural land. To the north, on the other side of the (elevated) A5 is the Meole Brace Park and Ride. The site is bounded to the east by a railway line to the other side of which is agricultural land and then a quarry. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | Rural location to the south of the A5. The site is located within the Green Gap between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY023 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Pulley Lane west and A5 south, Bayston Hill |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bayston Hill |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 16.50 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 495 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | This large site formed from part of a single field lies to the north but some distance away from Bayston Hill with a long frontage (approx. 750m) to the A5 and a significant frontage of approx. 370m to Pulley Lane. The site is currently used for agricultural purposes. Much of the western portion of the site (25% of total surface area) is a reclaimed waste site. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | The surrounding land is used for agricultural purposes. To the north of the site is a long frontage onto the A5 (750m) to the opposite side of which is further agricultural land. The eastern boundary is formed by Pulley Lane to the other side of which is further agricultural land. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is located within the Green Gap between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Bayston Hill than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY027 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Redhill Drive north, Bayston Hill |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bayston Hill |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 6.79 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 204 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site is formed of a long thin triangular piece of land amounting to 7ha that was once occupied by railway sidings and welding sheds which became disused in 1960 and were dismantled. The ground has now returned to a natural state and is now in appearance an area of scrubland between woodland areas. The site is therefore not categorised as brownfield. The site is elevated above neighbouring residential area at Redhill. The site is located 500m to the north of Hook-a-Gate , 500m to the north west of Bayston Hill and 1km to the south west of Shrewsbury to the south of the A5 and a railway line. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | The surrounding area is predominantly agricultural although to the south east of the site are a small number of dwellings on Redhill Drive above which the site is elevated. The site is bounded to the north by a railway line. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Conclusion:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability¹: | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is separated from the built form of the settlement. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Hook-a-Gate than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY043 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Gorse Lane end and west, Bayston Hill |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bayston Hill |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 4.92 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 148 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | A site to the north of Bayston Hill situated on land that slopes quite steeply down to the Rea Brook which forms the site's northern boundary. The site is currently used for agricultural purposes. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Gorse Lane and its associated residential development terminates at the southern boundary of the site. The remainder of the southern boundary and the western boundary is an area of woodland whilst the northern boundary is formed by Rea Brook beyond which is an area of scrubland prior to the A5, To the east of the site is agricultural land |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is located within the Green Gap between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill. The site is separated from the built form of the settlement. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Bayston Hill than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY045 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Dobbies Garden Centre south, Bayston Hill |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bayston Hill |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 7.27 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 218 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | This large site is formed of a single large field and extends the length of the A49 between the Bayston Hill services on the A5 nearly to the start of the Bayston Hill settlement, giving the site a frontage to the A49 of approx. 360m. The site is utilised for agricultural purposes and is flat. The site is neither within nor adjacent to the development boundary. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | To the north of the site is the garden centre and services on the A5/A49 roundabout. The western side is bounded by Lower Pulley lane to the opposite of which is mainly agricultural land but also includes the G2 listed Pulley Hall and its associated G2 listed barns. To the south of the site is a small field which then, in turn, borders onto the built form of Bayston Hill. The east of the site is formed by the A49 on the opposite of which is further agricultural land. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is located within the Green Gap between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill. The site is separated from the built form of the settlement. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Bayston Hill than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY046 |
| Site Address: | Hanley Lane north west, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.04 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 91 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is closely associated with site BAY043 of this study in that BAY046 skirts round the western and northern edges of BAY043 in an inverted "L" shape . The western element of BAY046 comprises a strip of open space land (approx. 400m long N-S with depth E-W varying between approx. 20-100m) which is mainly wooded but with some scrubland to its northern end. The northern element of BAY046 is defined by the line of a PROW that defines the northern extent of BAY043 and the Rea Brook. There is a marked downward slope S to N to the site. The site lies to the north of Bayston Hill and is outside the development boundary to which the south eastern side of the site is adjacent. |
| Surrounding Character: | To either side of the site is agricultural land whilst to the north is Rea Brook and an area of associated scrubland. To the south and south east of the site are dwellings associated with Gorse Lane |
| Suitability Information: Residential: <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is located within the Green Gap between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill. The majority of the site is heavily wooded. The southern element of the site most closely associated with the built form of the settlement is covered by a group TPO. The northern branch of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. The site is separated from the built form of the settlement. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Bayston Hill than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY047 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | The Former Railway Engineering Works |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bayston Hill |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.99 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 90 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site lies between Longden Road and the railway line. It is formed of a long thin triangular piece of land amounting to 7ha that was once occupied by railway sidings and welding sheds which became disused in 1960 and were dismantled. The ground has now returned to a natural state and is now in appearance an area of scrubland between woodland areas. The site is therefore not categorised as brownfield. The site is elevated above neighbouring residential area at Redhill. The site is located 500m to the north of Hook-a-Gate, 500m to the north west of Bayston Hill and 1km to the south west of Shrewsbury to the south of the A5 and a railway line. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | The surrounding area is predominantly agricultural although to the south east of the site are a small number of dwellings on Redhill Drive above which the site is elevated. The site is bounded to the north by a railway line. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | The site is separated from the built form of the settlement. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Hook-a-Gate than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BES001X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land adjacent to 2a Betton Strange Cottages, Betton Strange |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Betton Strange near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.04 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: The site lies to the south of the A5 in a very rural location. It is more closely associated with Betton Strange than Shrewsbury.</p> |
| Summary: | |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BES002 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north-east of Betton Strange |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Betton Strange near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.51 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 75 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of part of an agricultural field located in the countryside between Shrewsbury and Betton Strange. Site boundaries to north and south are defined by field boundaries, to the east it is defined by the road, to the west it is undefined, running through an agricultural field. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Primarily agricultural, although there are residential dwellings to the south of the site. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | The site lies to the south of the A5 in a very rural location. It is more closely associated with Betton Strange than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BES003 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south west of Weeping Cross Depot, Betton Strange |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Betton Strange near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 6.30 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 189 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of an agricultural field located to the south of the A5. The sites southern boundary is defined by a field boundary, its northern boundary is defined by the weeping cross depot/road, the sites northern boundary is defined by the A5/weeping cross depot, its western boundary is undefined running through an agricultural field. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to west and south is agricultural. Character to the east is a mix of agricultural and commercial. Character to the north is agricultural (land allocated for mixed use development). |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT026 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land East of Calcott Lane, south-east of Bicton |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bicton |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 15.24 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 457 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary of Four Crosses element of cluster. Site is currently in agricultural use for grazing/fodder crops. Site has agricultural land N, S, and W; to E is residential development and Brethren Meeting House. Site has extensive road frontage to both Holyhead Rd and Calcott Lane. Site has current vehicle access from Calcott Lane. Site boundaries are a mix of established hedgerows and trees with some additional fencing along Holyhead Rd. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural with built development to W |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is more closely associated with the built form of Four Crosses and/or Bicton than Shrewsbury. However due to the size of the site it is considered appropriate to include within Part 2 of the Site Assessment Process for Shrewsbury as well as Bicton. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT031 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north of Oxon Pool, Four Crosses |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bicton |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.92 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 88 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site is in agricultural use (grazing). |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential to the west, touring caravan park to south-east, agriculture otherwise. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: The site is more closely associated with the built form of Four Crosses than Bicton. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | GVH001X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Gravel Hill Farm, Gravels Hill, near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Gravels Hill near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.19 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | |
| <i>General Description:</i> | |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA.</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR001X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Underdale Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.17 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA.</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR002 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | The Hollies, Sutton Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.42 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 13 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 70% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | A large Victorian house, set within gardens and grounds. This property has previously been used as offices and a residential home for the elderly. There is also on site car parking. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | The surrounding character is primarily residential, although the adjacent building is a doctors surgery. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³:</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR003 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Richmond House, Harlescott, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.33 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 10 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | A brownfield site containing a series of buildings use for offices/children's care services; a large area of hardstanding used for carparking; and a landscaped area. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | The site is located in a primarily residential area. To the north and south east of the site are areas of open space. To the east of the site are residential dwellings. To the west of the site are residential dwellings and a Primary School. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³:</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR004 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Site at New Park Road/ St Michaels Street, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.21 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 6 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site comprises a mature brick built warehouse type building, converted to offices and a parking area. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | The site is in close proximity to a number of existing dwellings to its west. There are more dwellings, employment uses and retail uses surrounding the site. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR005 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Silkmoor, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.94 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 28 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | A diverse area containing a range of occupied buildings and car parking, located in the centre of Shrewsbury in Frankwell, near the Welsh Bridge. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | The site is located next to a recreation ground, retail units and residential developments. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR006 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Builders Yard, Betton Street, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.05 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 31 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Former Travis Perkins Builders yard now Network rail maintenance depot. Rail storage depot and maintenance operation site accessed at junction of Betton St, Belle Vue rd. and Old Coleham. Site comprises number of brick built maintenance buildings and office building together with 2 storey portacabin office building. Site has been in rail use or builders yard since 19th C. Site boundaries clearly defined by Betton St to W and rail lines to SE; boundary with adjoining site SHR150 to E not clearly defined. Access onto junction of Betton St/belle Vue road and Old Coleham shared with SHR150. Some self seeded shrubs/trees etc at S end of site. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding uses are a mix of residential and commercial. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR007 |
| Site Address: | William Farr House, Royal Shrewsbury Hospital, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.34 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 70 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Currently occupied by Physio and other units of RSH with associated car-parking. Single/two storey buildings on site. Road frontage and vehicle access onto Mytton Oak Rd. Boundaries clearly defined with adjoining residential development to W, S, and E along Falcon's Way, Copperfield Drive and Churchill Road. Some trees and hedgerows on SE boundary of site. Site is predominantly flat and well related and linked into surrounding residential development. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential estate development. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) | Currently Suitable |
| Employment: | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR008 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Garages, Off Belvidere Lane, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.19 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 6 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Small brownfield site in residential area of E Shrewsbury (Belvidere) comprising 12 lock-up garages, parking and landscaping adjacent Shrewsbury- Telford rail line and Belvidere lane. Wand E boundaries set by adjoining residential properties on Belvidere Rd and Belvidere Lane; N and S boundaries set by Belvidere Lane and railway. Site has road frontage and access to Belvidere lane, alternative access also available onto Belvidere Rd. Site well related to existing established residential estate. Some established trees on site on road frontage and adjoining railway. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Medium to high density ex-local authority residential estate development. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR011 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at the Elms, Belvidere, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.91 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 27 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 20% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site comprises a driveway, grounds of a Grade 2 listed building 'The Elms' including portacabin Scout Hut in grounds and lock-up garages but not 'The Elms' itself or sheltered housing at entrance. 'The Elms' House is NHS rehab and recovery service. Site has road access to Belvidere Ave but no road frontage as such; pedestrian access also via Belvidere Ave to existing network. Site boundaries clearly defined by adjacent residential properties and St Giles primary school playing fields. Many established mature trees including some TPO's on site and forming boundaries to S and N . |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential estate development and school playing fields to E. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR012 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Racecourse Lane, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.81 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 54 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site between racecourse Lane and RSH. Adjacent to Mytton Oak GP surgery to W and nurses accommodation and car parking to E; to N is Redwoods Centre (mental health care) and hospital maintenance buildings. Site is currently open space (in PPG17 study) used for informal recreation and consists of open grassland with some scrub trees on boundaries. Site has road frontage onto Racecourse Lane and Wellwood Close access could be from either; pedestrian access via Racecourse Lane to existing established links. Boundaries clearly defined to W by Racecourse Lane GP surgery and Redwoods Centre however E boundary with Hospital uses not clearly defined. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential estate development to W and Hospital to E. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: Much of the site forms part of an identified amenity green space. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR014 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Site at New Zealand House, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.48 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 14 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Brownfield site off Abbey Foregate comprising New Zealand House (an office block) and associated car parking/amenity area. Site has frontage onto Abbey Foregate to N and adjoins a recently converted apartment block (formerly offices) to W and retirement accommodation to E, and Reabrook valley to S. Some scrub trees and vegetation along Reabrook valley. Part of S portion of site within flood zones 2 and 3. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the north is predominantly residential. Character to the east and west are a mix of residential and commercial. Character to the south is typified by a natural/semi-natural open space along the bank of the River Severn. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR015 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Whitehall |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.01 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 30 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Brownfield site currently in use as Shropshire Walk-in Health Centre formerly Whitehall Govt offices. Site comprises flat roofed 2/3 storey office building and tarmac car parking area. Site has road frontage to Monkmoor Rd and is surrounded by existing residential properties of 19thC and early 20thC of Bishop St to S; Clifford St to W and Bishop St to N. Monkmoor Rd to E. Site contains 2 listed structures and some established trees especially on S boundary. Good existing pedestrian links via Monkmoor Rd. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR016 |
| Site Address: | Shrewsbury Training and Development Centre, Racecourse Crescent, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.31 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 9 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Current Shropshire Council Training and Development Centre. Brownfield site comprising 1/2 storey buildings and tarmac car parking area all in SC ownership. Road frontage to Racecourse Crescent. Boundaries clearly defined by Racecourse Cres to S and existing residential properties to E and W. N boundary not so clear - with rest of car park. Some established trees on W and S boundaries. Site also contains Electricity Sub-Station. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential, rest of car park and Monkmoor Rec ground to N |
| Suitability Information: Residential: <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Currently Suitable |
| Employment: | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³:</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR019 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Montgomery Way, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.58 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 47 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Remaining site to rear of Montgomery Way - previous application for affordable housing. Long standing open space currently used for informal recreation. New residential development to N; E boundary with Shrewsbury Sports Village, S and W boundary with old Shrewsbury-Newport canal now footpath and cycle way - NCN route 81. Many established trees along S and W boundary. Road frontage and access via Sandhurst Meadows; good pedestrian links via established networks. Site has slight rise from S to N. Evidence of GCN activity on site. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Mixed use - residential to N and open space/recreation use to S and W |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR020 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | St Michaels House, St Michaels Street, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.26 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 8 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Brownfield site within development boundary - site comprises 2 storey red-brick Victorian former school building now in use as podiatry clinic and associated tarmac car park. Site has road frontage to St Michaels St and separate road access from St Michaels St as well as good pedestrian links to town centre and nearby facilities . Site has clearly defined boundaries on all four sides. Some established trees on NE boundary. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Mixed residential some older 19thC properties and some more recent 21stC brownfield redevelopment. Large area open space and recreation facilities adjacent to NE of site. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR021X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Hubert Way, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.19 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR022X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Brierly House, Centre for the Deaf, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.06 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Not Known |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA.</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR023 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north west of Ellesmere Road roundabout, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 21.95 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 658 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large greenfield site to NW of Shrewsbury outside development boundary. Site currently in agricultural use for hay/silage and arable crops. Site currently as 2 fields split approx. 50:50 by irregular line of established hedgerow and trees. Boundaries clearly defined on 3 of 4 sides: by Bomere Heath road to S; by Ellesmere Rd to E; by lane to Huffley Farm to W but no clear definition to N. Some established trees and hedgerows on S, W and E boundaries as well as some scattered on N section of site. Site has road frontage to E onto Ellesmere Rd and S onto Bomere Heath road. Pedestrian links poor no existing footways or established network. 300KV overhead line across NE corner and pylon on site. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural use and farm and farm buildings of Huffley Farm to New |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR025 |
| Site Address: | Land east of Edgebold Roundabout, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.33 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 70 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is greenfield site outside development boundary adjacent to A5 bypass at roundabout junction with A488 (Edgebold roundabout) S of A488 and E of A5. Site in agricultural use for grazing/pasture Newton Farm lies approx. 80m to E. Site has defined boundaries with main roads and E due to existence of established trees and hedgerow along field boundaries. Site has road frontage to both A488 and A5 but access only possible off A488 potential for access to be developed in conjunction with adjacent site to E - SHR027. No existing pedestrian links. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural land |
| Suitability Information: Residential: <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR026 |
| Site Address: | land adjacent to A5 / A49 roundabout, east of Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 23.60 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 708 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large greenfield site to east of Shrewsbury outside development boundary and east of river severn adjacent to A5/A49 junction at Preston Boats. Currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site is bounded by A5 bypass and A49 to E, River Severn and farmland to W, Shrewsbury to Telford rail line to N and farmland to S. Boundaries with road, rail and river are clearly defined but boundaries with farmland appear arbitrary and undefined. Site is bounded by A5/A49 bypass and has road frontage technically but access likely to be difficult. Pedestrian access non-existent. Site is cut-off from Shrewsbury and any nearby settlements. Site slopes E-W down to river from bypass. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural land |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Employment: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR027 |
| Site Address: | Land at Newton Farm, Hanwood Road, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 16.82 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 505 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is greenfield site outside development boundary adjacent to site SHR025 and A5 bypass at roundabout junction with A488 (Edgebold roundabout) S of A488 and E of A5. Site in agricultural use for grazing/pasture includes Newton Farm house and buildings. Site has defined boundaries with main A488 to N and W/S due to existence of established trees and hedgerow along field boundaries. Site has road frontage to A488 access possible off A488 potential for access to be developed in conjunction with adjacent site to W - SHR025. No existing pedestrian links. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural land |
| Suitability Information: Residential: <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR031 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land rear of Abotts House, Upper Battlefield, north of Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.67 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 50 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside Shrewsbury's development boundary in ribbon settlement of Upper Battlefield. Agricultural site in use as rough grazing. Clear defined boundaries of established trees and hedgerows to N, S, and E to W with residential properties along A49. Site does not have road frontage but has access point onto A49, pedestrian access extremely limited but is footway/pavement along A49. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural land to N, S and E with residential properties to W. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR032 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north east of Ellesmere Road roundabout, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 17.48 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 524 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large greenfield site outside development boundary to north of Battlefield Enterprise Park sandwiched between A528 Ellesmere Rd and Shrewsbury Battlefield registered site. Site currently in agricultural use as 3 separate fields used for arable and fodder crops. Field in SW corner approx. 3.6ha is in SC freehold. Boundaries are clearly defined to W by A528 to S by A5124 (Battlefield distributor road) and E by historic battlefield, to N is not clearly defined - arbitrary line running across field. Road frontage onto A528 Ellesmere Rd and A5124, and access onto either. Pedestrian access via existing footway on A5124 to established network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and business use on Battlefield Enterprise Park. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR033X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Underdale Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.17 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR035 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Mousecroft Lane, Radbrook, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.60 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 48 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Former quarry and batching site operations now ceased. Outside development boundary to W of Shrewsbury. Site comprises former quarry related buildings and car parking along with landscaped areas on frontage of site. Site has clearly defined boundaries with adjacent open space through tree and woodland screening of previous quarry operations along with S boundary onto Mousecroft Lane. Site has road frontage and access onto Mousecroft Lane, pedestrian access poor no existing footway along Mousecroft Lane. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Open space with some adjacent residential properties on Mousecroft |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | The site forms part of an identified natural/semi-natural open space. The site contains a small part of the adjacent local wildlife site. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR036X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Upper Belle Vue |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.06 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA.</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR037 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Allotments, Stanley Lane, Meole Brace |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.80 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 54 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Current allotment site within development boundary on SW edge of Shrewsbury to S of Meole Brace secondary school. Site boundaries are clear and defined by Stanley Lane to N, Shrewsbury to Aberystwyth rail line to E, Longden Rd Business Park (protected employment land) to S, and residential properties on Silver Birch Drive to W. Site has road frontage and vehicle access onto Stanley Lane. Pedestrian access onto footway on Stanley lane then to links via established network. Some established trees on site boundaries and road frontage. Flat site. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential to E and W; employment |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is an identified allotment. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR038 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Kemps Eye Avenue |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.46 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 14 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Flat greenfield site currently open space (natural and semi-natural PPG17) and part car park and part of Marysville medical practice. Realistically site should now be redrawn to reflect construction of medical practice. Revised site does not have road frontage, vehicle access only via medical practice car park so effectively landlocked. Pedestrian access via existing established network. Revised site has clear defined boundaries with residential properties to W and S, medical practice to N and Shrewsbury Aberystwyth rail line to E. Some established trees and hedgerows on site boundaries. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential, further open space on opposite side railway, |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: Much of the site is an identified natural/semi-natural open space, the remainder of the site has been built out.</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR039X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Former School House, Long Row |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.14 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA.</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR040 |
| Site Address: | Land at Old Coleham adjacent Severn Stars Public House, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.21 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 6 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of a car park within the built form of Shrewsbury. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is varied, it includes further car parking, retail, other commercial uses and residential. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: The site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3.</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR041X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Faith Cottage, Sabrina Court, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.04 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Not Known |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR042 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Whitecroft Road adjacent Reabrook roundabout, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.57 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 17 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Triangular greenfield site within development boundary adjacent Reabrook roundabout. Site is formal open space as part of Reabrook valley and LNR. Site is also SC freehold. Site is grassed/scrub open space with established trees and hedgerows forming boundaries. To W is Reabrook roundabout, S residential estate development, E is open space of Rea Brook Valley LNR, N is Pritchard Way inner relief road. Site has road frontage onto roundabout and potential access off Uplands Drive to S. Pedestrian access via existing established network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential estate development to S; N & E open space; W roundabout and inner relief road |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site forms part of an identified natural/semi-natural open space. The site forms part of a Local Nature Reserve. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR043X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Moneybrook House, Knolls Farm Close, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.13 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Not Known |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR044 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Upper Battlefield, north of Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 5.92 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 177 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | one section of this site superseded by SHR195 call for sites 2017. Linear greenfield site outside development boundary between A49 on E and Shrewsbury-Crewe rail line to W. Site is currently divided into 2 parcels by access track to Battlefield farm and used for grazing/fodder crops. Road frontage exists to A49 along entire E boundary of site, additional vehicle access also off road to 1403 centre. Clear and defined boundaries to W with rail line to E with A49, to S with 1403 access road and residential development to N. Boundaries largely comprised established hedgerows and some trees. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural land and some residential also farm buildings. To W over rail line is registered historic battlefield. To SE is mixed employment land. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR046 |
| Site Address: | Land at Calders House, Upper Battlefield, north of Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.51 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 15 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | Approx. 20% |
| General Description: | Part greenfield site outside Shrewsbury development boundary. Site lies E of A49 to N of livestock market. Comprises large single dwelling and associated car parking outbuildings etc then large grazing/garden area including pond. Has existing frontage and access onto A49, no pedestrian access. Boundaries clearly defined by A49 to W and existing hedgerow boundaries N,E and S. Some established trees at E end of site and at W end on road frontage. Pond likely to have implications for GCN. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural land |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR053 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land to the west of Ellesmere Road (opposite Ellesmere Drive), Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.83 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 25 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside to adjacent to development boundary to W of Ellesmere Rd. Site is currently grass and scrub used for informal recreation and borders wildlife corridor of recent residential development to W and S also seasonal pond on site. Likely to be GCN and other wildlife implications. Road frontage onto Ellesmere Rd but no existing vehicle access; pedestrian access via established network. Site has slight downward slope E-W from Ellesmere Rd. E boundary with Ellesmere Rd, W boundary with recent Lovell Homes development adjacent railway; N boundary with Crest Nicholson residential development; S boundary with existing 19thC terraced housing on Ellesmere Rd. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR054a |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land South of the Shrewsbury Club, Sundourne Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 3.86 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 116 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site on E periphery of Shrewsbury outside development boundary and lies to rear of Welft leisure centre and N of Pimley Manor Barns business park. Greenfield site currently in agriculture use for grazing/fodder crops - site is predominantly flat. Site does not have road frontage but is accessed via lane to Pimley Manor. Site is bounded by leisure centre and associated uses to N and business park with associated commercial activities to S; W is open space provision with formal pitches and informal open space; E is wooded boundary with A49 bypass and further agricultural land to E. Boundaries to E and S in particular have substantial numbers of trees many mature and established. On S boundary of site is NCN route 81, bridleway, footpath and old Shrewsbury-Newport Canal. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Mixed use, recreation, business and agricultural. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR054b |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north-east of Shrewsbury Sports Village, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 6.96 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 209 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | A large agricultural field located to the north-east of Shrewsbury. The site is bounded by the A49 to the west; the B5062 to the south; and Sundorne pool, a tributary of the River Severn and associated woodland environs to the north and east. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to north is agricultural (currently a solar farm). Character to east is woodland/ponds, beyond which it is agricultural. Character to the west is predominantly residential (beyond the A49). Character to the south is a mix of agricultural and woodland. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR054c |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land east of Shrewsbury Sports Village, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 3.88 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 116 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of an agricultural field, several wooded areas and a tributary of the river severn. The site is also crossed by a public footpath. The sites northern and western boundaries is defined by the B5062, its western boundary is defined by the A49, its southern boundary is defined by a wooded belt. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to north is agricultural. Character to east is woodland/ponds, beyond which it is agricultural. Character to the west is a mix of agricultural and leisure uses (beyond the A49). Character to the south is a mix of agricultural, woodland and some rural dwellings. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR055 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south of Mytton Oak Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 6.54 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 196 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site part superseded by new submission 2017 by SHR161. Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary comprising Bowbrook allotments, agricultural land used for grazing/fodder and 5 separate detached dwellings at various points around the site. Site has linear element extending S to include Ley Grange. Development of whole site would entail loss of allotments. Site has scattered mature trees and mixture of established and remnant hedgerows defining boundaries with neighbouring agricultural land. Site has road frontage onto Mytton Oak Rd and existing vehicle access to allotments; pedestrian access via existing established network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential to N, agricultural to S, and E. W is site for proposed remembrance garden 12/05060/FUL pp 20/02/2013 |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR056 |
| Site Address: | Land south of Washford Road, Meole Brace, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 6.51 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 195 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to Shrewsbury development boundary. Site comprises no. of fields currently in agricultural use and including large single barn/storage on N boundary. Site is adjacent to Shrewsbury - Aberystwyth rail line to W and Rea Brook to S - significant proportion (c. 33%) of site in flood zones 2 and 3. Site is further bounded by Washford Rd and Meole Brace estate to N; and additional agriculture land to E. Site has road frontage and vehicle access to Washford Rd and pedestrian access via existing established network. Site is well contained by rail line, Rea Brook and Washford Rd and boundaries are defined by trees and hedgerows. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural to S and W and residential to N. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Employment: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR057 |
| Site Address: | Land West of Gains Park Way, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 51.46 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 1544 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on W of Shrewsbury between Gains Park development and A5 bypass, Currently in agricultural use for mix off grazing, fodder and arable crops. Contains original but still operational Corner Farm (Oak Farm now in parcel SHR177) and associated buildings and The Yews individual property. Site has road frontage onto Gains Park Way, Mytton Oak Road and Corner Farm Drive with existing vehicle access off Corner Farm Drive. Site has clearly defined boundaries to W with A5 bypass, E with Gains Park Way and S with Mytton Oak Rd; N boundary is with Shrewsbury West SUE. Boundaries mostly trees and hedgerows some established and mature. Site has scattered trees throughout some mature but no TPO/Veteran trees recorded on site. Site is bisected by significant area within flood zones 2 and 3 - approx. 11% of site. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential to E - Gains Park, agricultural to S and W and Shrewsbury SUE to N. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Employment: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR058 |
| Site Address: | Land at Sundorne Castle, east of Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 34.65 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 1040 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large greenfield site to E of Shrewsbury outside but not adjacent to development boundary. Site currently in agricultural use for grazing and fodder crops. Site contains number of listed buildings associated with Sundorne Castle and number of residential properties. Also contains extensive area of filled ground on W boundary along line of canal arm (?) now heavily wooded with many established trees. Site is irregular shape and boundaries not always clearly defined. Site has road frontage onto Newport Rd (B5062) and existing vehicle access; pedestrian access difficult no existing pavement or footway. To S of site is Shrewsbury Rugby Club, to W is agricultural land and solar farm; to E and N is agricultural land. Site also contains Sundorne Pool LWS and significant area in flood zones 2 and 3 approx. 22% of site. SW corner of site also bisected by 33kv overhead lines. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding uses are primarily agricultural, although there is a solar farm to the north-west and outdoor sports facilities to the south-east. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). Approximately 22% of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. The site contains part of a Local Wildlife Site. The site contains 5 grade 2 listed buildings. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR059X |
| Site Address: | Builders Yard, Washford Road, Meole Brace, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.09 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | |
| General Description: | |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.5ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA.</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR060 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Crowmeole/Upper Edgebold, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 17.26 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 518 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large greenfield site to W of Shrewsbury outside but adjacent to development boundary. Site consists number of fields currently in agricultural use for grazing/fodder crops. Site is currently landlocked and has no road frontage or separate vehicle access - however access likely to be delivered through adjacent allocated site (SHREW019 Land at Radbrook). No pedestrian access. Site is currently surrounded by agricultural use but N and E boundaries will be with housing as allocated site developed. Boundaries are clearly defined by existing hedgerows and trees. Hedgerows and trees also present within site marking internal field boundaries. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the south and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north and east is a mix of residential/ongoing residential development. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR063 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Hanwood Road / Nobold Lane, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.82 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 85 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on W edge of Shrewsbury. Site consists of single field in agricultural use for grazing/fodder crops with redundant/derelict barn in N corner of site. Site has road frontage onto Hanwood Rd and Nobold Lane. Vehicle access to barn off Hanwood Rd. Pedestrian access via existing established links on Hanwood Rd. Boundaries are clearly defined by Hanwood Rd to NW and Nobold Lane to NE; SE is further agricultural land separated by clear line of trees and hedgerows; SW boundary with properties and gardens of Brickyard Cottages. S portion of site contains no. of established trees and was part of former brickworks and contains historic landfill and previous infill sites. Site is opposite SHREW019 allocated site to NW and part adjacent to W edge of Radbrook housing estate. OS map shows ponds in S portion of site - maybe seasonal. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural to NW and S residential to N, SW and E |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR064 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Shillingston Drive, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.80 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 24 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site is greenfield site within development boundary. Site is currently garden/vacant land to N of Shillingston Drive between Battlefield Court to W and SHREW105 allocated site (u/c) and contains existing residential property - 84 Battlefield Road and part of Lion Coppice woodland. Site has road frontage onto Shillingston Drive but current vehicle access is via Battlefield Road. Pedestrian access via existing established network on Shillingston Drive. Site boundaries clearly defined apart from N boundary which is not clearly defined on the ground. Site contains no. of established trees |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential to E and W, commercial to S and woodland/garden land to N. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR065 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Monkmoor Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.41 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 42 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 60% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Mixed use site outside but adjacent to Shrewsbury development boundary within loop of River Severn and in proximity of Monkmoor sewage works. Site consists of 2 farm complexes now used for mix of employment uses including office and storage, also holiday lets and residential properties on site. Site is approx. 60% brownfield. Site has road frontage and vehicle access onto Monkmoor Rd. Pedestrian access via existing established network along Monkmoor Rd. Site has clearly defined boundaries to N with Monkmoor Rd; to E with STW access road ; to W with boundary of property; to S field boundaries less clearly defined by hedgerows and some fencing. Site adjoins site SHR111. Site has had numerous applications since 2000 associated with various changes of use and minor extensions etc also pp for waste transfer operation associated with Skip Hire business. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | To S further scrub land - possibly treated; N River Severn; W employment land and E edge of Monkmoor Rd residential properties. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR066 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Lower Pulley Lane, south of Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.18 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site below threshold but promoted on basis of 5+ on site and within urban setting. Site currently greenfield outside but adjacent to Shrewsbury development boundary in 'green gap' between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill. Currently rough grazing/scrub land. Boundaries clearly defined to N by Pulley Lane to S by adjacent residential properties; to W by Lower Pulley Lane and E by agriculture land. Road frontage onto Pulley Lane and Lower Pulley Lane; current vehicle access off Lower Pulley Lane. Pedestrian access via established networks from Pulley Lane |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential to S and N agriculture to E and W |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR067 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Castle Foregate, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.38 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 11 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Brownfield former railway land. In employment use for container self-storage in protected employment zone. Site located between rail lines to Chester and Crewe. Site is bounded by rail lines to E, W S by The Castle Business Park and to N by POS associated with Greenfields Gardens. Site has road frontage to access road and vehicle access under railway bridge via Castle Foregate. Pedestrian access via Castle Foregate to established network. No trees or hedgerows on site, within flood zone 2 and 3 of Bagley Brook |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Employment land, railway line and associated land, new residential development on Greenfields Gardens and Bagley Social Club. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | The site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR074 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Curia Close off Corinthian Close (Underdale) Allotments, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.15 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 35 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Currently in use as allotments (sui generis). Site lies to E of Underdale Rd and Corinthian Close and to W of Robertson Way. Site has no road frontage; current vehicle access to allotments via Gregson Close maybe alternative via Curia Close. Pedestrian access via Gregson and Curia Close to established network. Site is bounded by residential properties to W and S; to N is further allotment land and E is Robertson Way. Some established trees and hedgerows on SW, S and E boundaries. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding character is predominantly residential, however there are further allotments to the north-east. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: The site forms part of an identified allotment. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR075X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Salop Leisure, Hereford Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.17 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of part of a wider employment site. Site boundaries are defined by the brook to the south, they are less defined to north, east and west. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding character is a mix of the employment uses on the wider site and open space. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR076 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Open Space at Meole Brace, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.73 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 22 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site is an area of natural/semi-natural open space located within the built form of Shrewsbury. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Located to the east of the site is the Holy Trinity Church and its grounds (adjacent to the site). Surrounding uses to north and west are predominantly residential. Uses to the south are also leisure/open space. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site forms part of an identified natural/semi-natural open space. The site does not have a road frontage / potential access, being separated from Church Road by a wooded belt, subject to TPO protection. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR077 |
| Site Address: | S.C.R. Retail Systems, Kendal Road, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.04 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 91 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | An existing mixed use site encompassing protected employment land (Centurion Park) and residential area (Ambleside) with play area. Also includes area of freehold land - 3.91ha. Contains a range of employment buildings and employment uses. A portion of the site is available for redevelopment and there is a current application for further employment buildings on it. Site contains number of individual TPO's. Lies adjacent to Shrewsbury-Crewe rail line with group TPO on border with site. |
| Surrounding Character: | To the west and north are employment uses; to the east are residential and retail; to the south is residential. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Employment: | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR080 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Oteley Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.08 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 32 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site lies N of Oteley Rd and adjacent Oteley Bungalow. Site bounded by Sutton Grange Drive to E, Meole Brace Golf Course to W, Sutton Nursery to N and Oteley Rd to S. Site currently in agricultural use bounded by established trees to S and W and by hedgerows to N and E. Flat site, with road frontage to Oteley Rd and vehicle access via Sutton Grange Drive. Pedestrian and cycle access via Oteley Rd. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | New residential to E, municipal golf course to W, and agriculture to N |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR081 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Site at Wyle Cop, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.01 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 30 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Brownfield site currently used as parking. There is some greenfield land on the site and a large portion of the site is available for redevelopment. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | The site is in proximity to several listed buildings and is west of the river Severn. To the west and south of the site is mixed use development predominantly retail and residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. Approximately 25% of the site is a natural/semi-natural open space. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR083 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Sundorne Retail Park. (Current B&Q store) |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.48 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 74 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | An existing retail site. Currently contains B&Q store building and associated car parking. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Land north, east and west of the site is used for employment. There are residential buildings south of this site. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The majority of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR084 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Travis Perkins, Wood Street, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.74 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 82 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Existing employment site - builders yard (Travis Perkins) |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential land to the north and west of the site and open space to the south. Shrewsbury-Crewe rail line and sidings on E boundary. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR085 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Communications House, Harlescott Lane, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.46 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 44 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Existing employment site (former BT dept and offices). Road frontage and vehicle access with Harlescott Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via Harlescott Lane. Established trees with TPO's on N boundary of site. Shrewsbury-Crewe rail line forms W boundary of site. Site in close proximity to level crossing on Harlescott Lane. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Employment land north, east and west of the site; residential land (off Kendall Road) to the south. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR086 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Perkins, Lancaster Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 4.37 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 131 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 75% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site has been safeguarded for employment development and it is currently in employment use. Approximately 75% of the site is covered by built form (buildings and hard standing) the remaining 25% of the site is landscaped. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to south, east and west is predominantly residential. Character to the north is predominantly employment. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR088 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Lidl Supermarket, Whitchurch Rd, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.66 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 20 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Existing retail use (Lidl supermarket), bookmakers and associated car parking. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Employment to west and south of the site; residential land south and south-east, further retail; uses to N (Tesco) |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Unlikely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR090X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | 77 Coton Hill, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.04 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of a building and its curtilage. Site boundaries are defined by the properties curtilage. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential, employment and open space. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR093 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land to the east of Nobold Lane, Longden Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 7.96 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 239 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site predominantly flat currently in agricultural use for rough grazing. Bounded to W by Nobold La; to SE by Longden Rd; to N by Mousecroft Lane; and to E by allocated housing site (land off Longden Rd and Mousecroft La). E boundary of site defined by mature trees and established hedgerow along route of stream (seasonal?) |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential land to the north and east; protected employment land south of the site; and agricultural land west of the site. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: Landscape sensitivity identified within a recent appeal. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR096 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Coton Grange, Corporation Lane, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 17.25 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 518 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large irregular, undulating greenfield site outside development boundary containing several small buildings in N portion and including residential properties at S end on Benbow Close and Corporation Lane. Site access via Corporation Lane - substandard single track; no road frontage as such. Site bounded by Shrewsbury-Chester rail line to E, agriculture land/open space to W, old river bed to N; and residential properties off Coton Mount and Corporation Lane. Boundaries defined but hedgerow/field boundaries or residential properties. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Greenfield land surrounding site on north and western sides; residential land south of site. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR099 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north east of Woodcote Way, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.36 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 41 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Site contains access road to allocated site Shrew 120 (Land east of Woodcote Way). Currently in agriculture use for arable/fodder crops. Has road frontage and existing access off Woodcote Way, pedestrian and cycle access also via Woodcote Way. Site has clearly defined boundaries SE, SW, NW but NE boundary is arbitrary line across field with no defining features. Site has slight fall SE-NW. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agric use to NE, golf driving range to NW, residential to SW, schools (Wilfred Owen/Severndale) to SE. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR100 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north of Shelton Lane, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 8.74 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 262 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Elongated linear site N of Shelton Lane adjacent to river Severn including land N of Bryn Rd/The Mount. Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Linear element of site is currently scrub woodland, larger portion N of Bryn Rd is currently open space/agriculture use - grazing. Highway access and road frontage off Shelton Lane. Boundaries of site clearly defined by River Severn, Shelton Lane and residential properties off Bryn Rd. Site includes element of flood zone and is adjacent to River Severn LWS |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural land to the north and east; the Severn is north of the site. Residential land south and west. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR101X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land adj. Red Barn Lane, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.13 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of part of a wider wooded belt. Site boundaries are defined by property curtilages to the south, Red Barn Lane to the north and east but are undefined to the west. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential and woodland. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.5ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR103 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Shrewsbury Cricket Club, London Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.46 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 74 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 90% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site currently used as a cricket ground with associated car parking and club house, changing rooms, practice facilities etc. Greenfield site within development boundary. If site is to be developed suitable alternative site must be provided. Site has road frontage and access off London Rd, pedestrian and cycle access via London Rd and established network. Clearly defined boundaries with surrounding residential properties and London Rd. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Emstrey Crematorium is northeast of the site. Land north, west and south of the site is residential. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is an identified outdoor sports facility. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR104 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land North of A5/A458 Welshpool Road Roundabout, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 3.30 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 99 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site in agricultural use, to the north of the proposed route of the Oxon Link Road and the Shrewsbury West Sustainable Urban Extension. The site abuts properties within the settlement of Calcott to the north. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the south is currently agricultural, however this land is allocated for development. Character to the east is agricultural/leisure (caravan site). Character to the west is agricultural. Character to the north is mixed residential and agricultural. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The land is a proposed open space associated with the Shrewsbury West SUE. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR105 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Golf Course, Oteley Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 35.00 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 1050 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 15% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site on S edge of town within development boundary. Currently municipal golf course. Site bisected by Shrewsbury - Ludlow rail line and A5112 Hazeldine Way. Managed golf course appearance with parcel on E edge of site in agricultural use. Rea Brook forms N boundary and also runs through site - Local Nature Reserve. Site contains number of mature trees and established hedgerows. Site boundaries are clearly defined by Rea Brook to N and W by B4380 Oteley Rd to S and with Sutton Grange to E. Road frontage to B4380 access to existing established footpath links. Shropshire Way long distance path owes Rea Brook LNR and other PROWs across site. Relatively flat site with some undulations but steep river terrace on NW boundary. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential to W N and E. Agric to E. S B4380 and Meole Brace retail park, STFC football stadium and mixed agriculture land. SW is a fitness gym and pitch and putt site. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | Much of the site is an identified outdoor sports facility; natural/semi-natural open space; or amenity green space. Elements of the site are also located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR106 |
| Site Address: | Land to rear of 57 Porthill Rd, Porthill, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.38 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 11 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site to S of Porthill Shrewsbury adjacent to NW corner Shrewsbury School. Site within development boundary and conservation area. Currently used as informal recreation and open space. Clearly defined boundary with residential properties to N and W and Shrewsbury School playing fields to d E. boundary of mixed trees and hedgerows. Flat site no issues with topography. Access not clear - depends on site ownership potential onto Porthill or Roman Rd - no road frontage as such. Pedestrian access via existing established links. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential properties to N and W open aspect of Shrewsbury School sports fields to W and S. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The site appears to be without a road frontage / point of access. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR109 |
| Site Address: | Land at Cross Hill, Shrewsbury (West of Cross Hill Farm; North of Hencott Farm; East of Railway) |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 50.74 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 1522 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large area of agricultural land to W of and separated from development boundary. Adjoining Shrewsbury - Chester rail line south of Hencott Pool SSSI/Ramsar/LWS. No obvious access or road frontage. W boundary with rail line; S boundary with track to Hencote Farm; E and N boundary comprise hedgerow and trees with adjacent agriculture land. Veteran trees also present on site. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural. Hencott Pool SSSI/Ramsar site adjacent to N. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR110 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Mytton Oak Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 9.16 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 275 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Irregular elongated site to W but adjacent to development boundary. Adjacent to existing allocate site SHREW030/R (land at Bowbrook) In agricultural use - grazing. Flat site with some undulations. No road frontage or highways access obvious, no links to existing pedestrian network. Boundaries on all sides comprised trees and hedgerows not clearly defined with adjacent fields. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural land and buildings. E is allocated housing site. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR111 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Monkmoor Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.14 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 64 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Outside but adjacent to development boundary on E edge of town in loop of river Severn adjacent to Monkmoor sewage works. Site is possibly 'made' land from previous sewage treatment and cannot be used for agriculture. Site is currently scrub land with some established trees on W and E boundaries. S portion of site contains existing buildings relating to treatment plant. Boundaries clearly defined to W by access road; N by residential properties and Monkmoor Farm buildings and S by remaining treatment works buildings; E boundary to adjoining scrub land not clearly defined. Site does not have road frontage and access via treatment works access road which is in turn accessed via narrow lane off the end of Monkmoor Rd. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | To E further scrub land - possibly treated; N residential properties and Monkmoor Farm industrial estate buildings; W protected employment land and N edge of Hamilton Drive residential properties. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR115 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land adj. Longden Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.72 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 21 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Linear site dropping down from Longden Rd to Rad Brook valley along E edge of public footpath (the 'Cinder Track'). Currently vacant site - informal scrub woodland part of extensive wooded area along valley floor. Boundaries clearly defined to W with Kingsland Grange Prep School; to E with public footpath; to S with residential property (144 Longden road) and to N with residential properties on Kennedy Rd. No road access or road frontage; pedestrian access via public footpath onto established links on Kennedy Rd or Longden rd. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounded by similar parcels of wooded scrub land and School playing fields to W; and Rad Brook to N. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: In isolation, the site is landlocked and does not appear to have a road frontage. Whilst there are other site promotions which could provide an access, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s). A small portion of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR116 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land adj. Longden Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.79 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 24 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Linear site dropping down from Longden Rd to Rad Brook valley along W edge of public footpath (the 'Cinder Track'). Currently vacant site - informal scrub woodland part of extensive wooded area along valley floor. Boundaries clearly defined to W with residential property ; to W with public footpath; to S with residential properties along Longden road and to N with residential properties on Kennedy Rd/Beehive Lane. No road access or road frontage; pedestrian access via public footpath onto established links on Kennedy Rd or Longden rd. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounded by similar parcels of wooded scrub land and residential properties to E and S; and Rad Brook to N. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹ :</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: In isolation, the site is landlocked and does not appear to have a road frontage. Whilst there are other site promotions which could provide an access, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s). A small portion of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR117 |
| Site Address: | Former Leoni Premises, Arlington Way, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.62 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 19 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Within development boundary and in protected employment zone existing employment building currently in use as D2 - gym . Part of Sundorne Trade Park to E of B&Q and The Range retail stores. Boundaries clearly defined by neighbouring retail/trade and industrial units. Vehicle access and road frontage via Henley Way; pedestrian access via Henley Way and Arlington Way to established networks on Battlefield Way. |
| Surrounding Character: | Industrial/trading Estate. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The majority of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR120 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | The Sentinel Works, Whitchurch Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 3.50 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 105 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site has been safeguarded for employment development and it is currently in employment use. The entirety of the site is covered by built form (buildings and hard standing). |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to north and east is predominantly residential. Character to the south is retail (large supermarket and its car-park). Character to the west is employment/commercial. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR121 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Castle Foregate, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.36 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 71 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Within development boundary and in protected employment zone existing employment buildings currently in use as employment, rail depot and coal yard, parking and additional storage. Bounded by Shrewsbury Crewe rail line to E; Bagley Brook, timber yard, residential and Bagley social club to W; further employment land to S; and vacant rail land to N. Road access via Castle Foregate; pedestrian access via established links from Castle Foregate. No trees or hedgerows on site. Within flood zone of Bagley Brook |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Employment land, railway line and associated land, new residential development on Greenfields Gardens and Bagley Social Club. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The majority of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR123 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Pritchard Way, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.58 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 17 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site adjacent to roundabout at Old Potts Way and Pritchard Way. Accessed via track off Reabrook Ave but access maybe in alternative ownership, no other road frontage pedestrian access possible onto Pritchard Way. Site bounded by residential properties to SW and SE: by recreation ground to W and Old Potts Way and Pritchard Way to N and E. Site is open space and part of Reabrook Local nature Reserve, currently grassed area bounded by trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential and other open space/recreational space |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is located within a Local Nature Reserve. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR124X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Long Meadow Drive, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.18 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of two large properties and their curtilages. Site boundaries are defined by the curtilages of the existing properties. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential and employment. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR126 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off St Michaels Street and New Park Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.67 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 20 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Brownfield site in central location. Currently in use as agricultural machinery and plant hire operation including offices and storage. Site comprises steel framed storage buildings, tarmacked storage areas behind Victorian brick frontage. Site has road and pedestrian access off New Park Road and additional road frontage onto St Michaels Street. Boundaries clearly defined by neighbouring uses, surrounding area is mix of employment, commercial and residential uses. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Mix of employment, commercial and residential uses. Line of old Shrewsbury- Newport Canal on E boundary of site. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR127 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Industrial Unit, Monkmoor Trading Estate, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.91 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 27 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Brownfield site in employment use. Not in protected employment zone but application refused and appeal dismissed for residential use in 2017. Various occupiers frontage is carpet sales and showroom. Boundaries clearly defined by surrounding property both employment, retail and residential. Site has frontage and road/pedestrian access via Monkmoor Rd and potentially via Conway. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Predominantly residential but site also adjoins protected employment site to N and retail to S. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR131 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Fire Station, St Michaels Street, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.76 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 23 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Current operational fire station and HQ. Comprising offices, accommodation, garaging, storage, training, maintenance etc. Redeveloped/refurbished in 2010/11. Road frontage onto Crewe St and St Michaels St - pedestrian and vehicle access via Crewe St. Boundaries clearly defined by surrounding streets and neighbouring properties. Shrewsbury-Crewe rail line to W. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Mixed use area - residential, retail and employment use. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Unlikely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR132 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Morris Oil Works, St Michaels Street, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.88 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 56 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Current Morris Lubricants depot and offices. 2-3 storey brick buildings within conservation area. Site also includes Plough Public House, 2x takeaways and Dentist. Boundaries completely defined and set by adjoining properties, Castle Foregate to W, New Park Road to N and Beacasll's Lane to E. Road frontage onto Castle Foregate but alternative access available via New Park rd. Pedestrian access via Castle Foregate and New park road to existing established links. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Mixed use area |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR134 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | GPO Main Sorting Office, St Michaels Street, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.78 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 53 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Edge of town centre site currently occupied by main Post office sorting office, car park, Britannia Inn and Buttermarket night club. Sorting office 2-3 storey late C20th brick built with modern steel clad maintenance and machinery depot buildings. Buttermarket Grade 2 listed building originally at terminal of canal. Whole site has previous industrial heritage from 19th and 20th century railway uses. Boundaries clearly defined by surrounding streets and neighbouring properties; Howard St to S, Beacall's Lane to E, Castle Foregate to W and Morris Lubricants site (SHR132) to N. Vehicle access currently via Howard St, pedestrian access also via castle Foregate. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Mixed use are including employment, retail and residential - on edge of town centre. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR137X |
| Site Address: | White Mist, 6 Dunedin Drive, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.19 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | Approx. 30% |
| General Description: | The site consists of a large residential property and its curtilage. The properties curtilage defines the site boundaries. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR138X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | 2-5 Bridge Street, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.01 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of an existing building. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Primarily commercial. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR139 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | County Divisional Surveyors Office, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.09 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 33 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Peripheral location within development boundary 50% currently occupied by Arrow County Supplies and Arrow House offices and associated car parking; remaining 50% vacant site former builders merchants. Road frontage onto Longden road and access via industrial estate distributor road. Boundaries poorly defined with Council maintenance depot to E but otherwise clearly defined by adjoining property and Longden Rd. established trees on road frontage. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Established employment site with employment and commercial uses opposite allocated housing site currently under construction. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR140 |
| Site Address: | Barnabas Church Centre, Belle Vue, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.31 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 9 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Brownfield site currently occupied by Barnabas Church and hall with associated car parking. Boundaries clearly defined - River Severn to rear forms N boundary, Longden Rd forms S boundary, E&W boundaries with adjoining properties. Site has road frontage and vehicle access onto Longden Rd; pedestrian access via Longden Rd. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding uses are a mix of residential and commercial. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR141X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | 13 Underdale Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.05 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of a dwelling and its curtilage. Site boundaries are defined by the existing properties curtilage. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential and open space. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR142 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Nobold Glebe, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 3.19 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 96 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large irregular site - single field in agricultural use (currently grass/silage) existing barn at southern corner of site. Outside but adjoining development boundary. Boundaries well defined by rail line to E, Longden Road to W, Washford Rd to S and residential properties (Sweetlake cottages) and Longden Rd industrial estate to N. Established hedgerow and trees along all boundaries. Road frontage onto Longden and Washford Roads location of current access not clear. Site largely flat but with slight upward slope N-S. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Mix of agricultural land to S and W - urban area to N - residential and Longden Rd business park and residential estate development to E - Meole Brace. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR143X |
| Site Address: | Land at Nobold Farm, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.08 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Vacant plot. Forms part of a wider promotion. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability ¹ : As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size ² : As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.5ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability ³ : As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR144X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Roman Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.10 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | A small portion of a wider field, site boundaries are defined by the road to the south, a wooded area to the east but are undefined to north and west. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and residential. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR145 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Meole Brace Retail Park, Hereford Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 5.79 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 174 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site is greenfield site outside but adjoining development boundary. Site lies between Meole Brace Retail park and Meole Brace park and ride site. Although not isolated from built development site would be isolated from other residential development. Site has road frontage and access to A5112 and Meole Brace Park and Ride access road which currently splits site 3:1. Boundaries clearly defined by adjoining uses and road and rail corridors. Site is currently grassed but appears unused slight rise N-S. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Meole Brace Retail Park to the north, railway line to the east, Park and Ride to the south and residential to the west. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR146 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Arlington Way, Sundorne, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.83 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 25 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Within development boundary and in protected employment zone. Part of Sundorne Trade Park to E of B&Q and The Range retail stores. Boundaries clearly defined by neighbouring retail/trade and industrial units. Vehicle access and road frontage via Henley Way and Arlington Way; pedestrian access via Arlington Way to established networks on Battlefield Way and Featherbed Lane |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Industrial/trading estate |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR147 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Arlington Way, Sundorne, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.18 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 35 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Within development boundary and in protected employment zone. Part of Sundorne Trade Park to E of retail stores. Boundaries clearly defined by neighbouring retail/trade and industrial units. Vehicle access and road frontage via Arlington Way; pedestrian access via Arlington Way to established networks on Battlefield Way and Featherbed Lane. E boundary of site formed by Battlefield Brook and flood zone 2 of brook encroaches into a portion of site. Residential estate development on E side of brook. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Industrial/trading estate. With residential estate development to E separated by Battlefield Brook. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR148 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Red Barn Lane, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.64 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 19 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Currently vacant site - informal scrub woodland part of extensive wooded area along valley floor. Boundaries not clearly defined to W with residential property and SHR116 ; to W with further vacant land; to S with Red barn pub and car park along Longden road and to N with residential properties at end of Red Barn lane . No road access or road frontage access appears to be via current pub car park; pedestrian access onto established links on Longden rd. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Similar wooded scrub land to W and E and N. Red Barn pub and car park and Longden Rd to S. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is landlocked and does not appear to have a road frontage. Whilst there are other site promotions which could provide an access, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s). A small portion of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR149 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land adj. to A5, Nobold |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 10.22 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 307 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Agricultural field and wooded area to the West of Shrewsbury and Nobold. The site is outside the Shrewsbury development boundary and separated from it by other promoted sites, but within the A5 bypass. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). Furthermore, in isolation, the site is landlocked and does not appear to have a road frontage, but there is another site promotion which could provide an access to the site (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR150 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Coleham Depot Redline, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.07 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 32 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Ex-rail storage depot and maintenance operation site accessed at junction of Betton St, Belle Vue road and Old Coleham. Site contains brick built maintenance sheds and depots and external hard standing storage areas. Site has been in rail use since early 19thC . Boundaries well defined to E by rail lines and to NW by residential properties on Old Coleham; SW boundary with existing Network rail depot (SHR006) not clearly defined. Road access onto junction with Belle Vue road no road frontage as such; pedestrian access via established links. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Mixed use area, high density terraced housing, commercial uses, and rail operations. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR154 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land adj. to Darville, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.78 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 54 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site is located within development boundary adjacent to Telford Way on NE boundary and river Severn on SE boundary NW and SW boundaries with existing residential estate development and properties on Darville. Site comprises low lying fields used for grazing/silage crops with established trees on river bank and along NW boundary. Site has no direct road frontage but would be accessed via existing junction with Darville. Pedestrian access via Daville to established network also Severn Way public footpath and long distance route along river bank on E boundary. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural - grazing to S along river flood terrace and residential estate development to W. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The majority of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR157 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south of the A5, The Day House, Nobold |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 42.74 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 1282 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large site to W of and adjacent to Shrewsbury A5 bypass forming irregular area stretching from Shrewsbury-Aberystwyth rail line to A488. Site comprises number of fields used for pasture/fodder crops with some arable. Some remnant hedgerow boundaries and established trees separating fields internally; clear boundaries with rail line and A5 bypass with established trees on the latter; remaining boundaries to E and W not clearly defined apart from short stretch along A488. Site has road frontage and potential access onto A488 by 'Two-mile Houses' approx. 250m from junction on A5 bypass. Pedestrian access v.poor no existing network or footways. Site is isolated from any development by road and rail line, over 500m to nearest residential development and over 1500m to nearest facilities in Hanwood. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural land; village of Hanwood approx. 1.5km to W and edge of Shrewsbury 1 - 1.5km to E. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR157VAR |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south of the A5, The Day House, Nobold |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 63.49 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 1905 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | <p>Large site to the west of and adjacent to Shrewsbury A5 bypass. Site comprises a large number of fields used for pasture/fodder crops with some arable. Some remnant hedgerow boundaries and established trees separating fields internally. Site has road frontage and potential access onto A488, it also has a road frontage onto the A5 bypass. Pedestrian access v.poor no existing network or footways.</p> <p>Site is separated from residential development in Shrewsbury by the road and rail line. It also forms much of the gap between Shrewsbury and Hanwood Bank.</p> <p>Site boundaries are defined by the A488 to the north, the A5 to the east, the railway line to the south and substantial wooded areas along the route of a dismantled railway line to the west.</p> |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural land. Villages of Hanwood and Hanwood Bank 0.2 and 0.75km to the west respectively. Shrewsbury Town 1 - 1.5km to the east. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | <p>Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.</p> <p>Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses.</p> <p>To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.</p> |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²:</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA.</p> |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR158 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Upper Edgebold, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 75.47 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 2264 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large irregular shaped greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on W edge of Shrewsbury urban area bordered by A5 bypass on W side. Site comprises 5 agriculture fields currently used for grazing/fodder/arable crops and farmhouse/complex of Upper Edgebold. S boundary of site is with Hanwood Rd (A488) and Mount Edgebold Farm; N with SC freehold area identified as future burial facility off Mytton Oak Rd and with Ashleigh Farm; E with allocated site 'Land at Bowbrook' (SHREW030/R) and agriculture land. Site has road frontage and potential access off Hanwood Rd (A488) and potentially from A5 bypass. Site boundaries are defined by adjacent road routes and established trees/hedgerows - some scattered. Site is isolated from urban area currently but will have connection when allocated site completed. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural land and road routes. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR159 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Mousecroft Lane, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 11.76 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 353 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on W edge of Shrewsbury off Radbrook estate. Site is currently in use as public open space and is also designated LWS. S portion of site was former sand and gravel quarry and elements are 'filled land' and there are a number of ponds on site associated with previous quarry use. Large amount of trees/woodland on site with established trees and hedgerows along boundaries. N portion of site is reclaimed historic landfill (Nobold Lane tip). Site boundaries are clearly defined by surrounding residential properties to N, E, and S, to W with woodland, remaining quarry buildings, SC freehold land and Conduit Head grade 2 listed building. Road frontage and highway access to Mousecroft Lane and potential access via residential streets in Radbrook estate. Site has varied topography and a number of steep slopes as a result of former uses. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential, open space |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | The site forms part of an identified natural/semi-natural open space. The site forms part of a local wildlife site. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR160 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Battlefield, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 3.76 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 113 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside Shrewsbury's development boundary in ribbon settlement of Upper Battlefield. Agricultural site in use as rough grazing. Clear defined boundaries of established trees and hedgerows to N, S, E, and W with A49. Site has road frontage and access point onto A49, pedestrian access extremely limited but is footway/pavement along A49. to N of site is former vehicle scrap yard no longer in use and site also borders area of designated ancient woodland. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural, to E, S, W, single residential property also to S. Former scrap yard to N. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR161 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Bowbrook, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 8.49 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 255 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside development boundary in SC ownership currently in agricultural use. Site comprises 2 fields in use for grazing/fodder crops larger of which is to S divided by established hedgerow. Site contains no. of established trees. Boundaries are clearly defined by established field boundaries and trees/hedgerows. Site has road frontage and access onto Mytton Oak Rd; pedestrian and cycle access also via Mytton Oak Rd. Site not currently well related to urban area. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agriculture, and residential properties. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR162 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north of Holyhead Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 17.24 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 517 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Site comprises 7 separate field units currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops with no of scattered established trees especially along Featherbed Lane. Site boundaries are clearly set by Holyhead Rd to W; Udlington Farm, woodland and Shelton Rough LWS to N; to E by Shelton Rough LWS; and S by further agriculture land. Boundaries clearly defined on the whole by trees and established hedgerows. Site is bisected by Featherbed Lane - access track to LWS and part of Severn Way long distance path. Site has road frontage with Holyhead Rd and existing access off Holyhead Rd to LWS via Featherbed Lane track. Pedestrian and cycle access via Holyhead Rd to established network. Site is largely flat site with slight fall W-E towards river Severn. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Largely agriculture land and woodland but also adjacent Udlington Farm complex and buildings, and opposite Severn Hospice and Uplands care facility. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR163 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Cross Hill Farm, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 22.91 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 687 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Irregularly shaped parcel consisting of several agricultural fields to the north of Shrewsbury (west of Ellesmere Road). |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the North and West is agricultural. Character to the East is residential. Character to the South is a mixture of agricultural and residential. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR164 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Emstrey, south east of Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.94 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 88 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside development boundary. Site currently in agriculture use for grazing/fodder crops. Site boundaries clearly defined to S by B4380; to N by River Severn; to E by Emstrey Farm and residential conversions but W boundary with adjacent field is arbitrary field boundary and not well defined. Site has road frontage and existing access from B4380. Pedestrian and cycle access via B4380 to established network. Site not well related to urban form of Shrewsbury and would form isolated parcel of new development in the open countryside. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | River Severn, agricultural land, farm complex and residential conversions, caravan sales and caravan site. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: The site is isolated from the built form of the settlement. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR165 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land to north-west of Hazeldine Way, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.77 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 23 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site within development boundary. Boundaries clearly set by Rea Brook, Shrewsbury-Hereford rail line, Hazeldine Way and PPG17 open space all boundaries defined by established trees/woodland and hedgerows. Site has road frontage to Hazeldine Way but no access. Pedestrian and cycle access via Hazeldine Way to established links. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Woodland, open space and residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR166 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land to the east of Shrewsbury - to the north of the railway line; west of the A49; and east and south of the river severn. |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 43.28 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 1298 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large greenfield site outside development boundary E of River Severn bounded by river to E and N, A49 bypass to W and Shrewsbury-Wolverhampton rail line to S. Site is landlocked but has boundary with A49 bypass nor is their current access. Pedestrian and cycle access not currently possible. Site boundaries defined by hedgerows /trees with A49 bypass and railway. Site boundary on W is arbitrary line drawn to avoid flood zone although element of site is still within zones 2 and 3. Site is separated from urban area by river and has not well related to existing settlement. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural land and riparian zone. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available for Mixed Use Development |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR167 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Shelton Lane, north of Mountwood Park, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.52 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 15 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Small greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary between urban form and River Severn off Shelton Lane. Site is bounded by Shelton La/Severn Way to S, and scrub woodland to N, E and W. Site contains number of established mature trees and on boundaries. Site is accessed by Shelton Lane/Severn Way but is currently not suitable for vehicles at this point. Pedestrian and cycle access also via Shelton Lane/Severn Way. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential and scrub woodland. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | The site does not have a road frontage / point of access. A small portion of the site is located within flood zone 2. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR168 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Corporation Lane, Coton Hill, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.12 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 33 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 10% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Linear mostly greenfield site mostly outside but with S portion inside development boundary. Boundaries set by Corporation Lane to W, recent new development to S, Shrewsbury-Chester rail line to W and woodland to N, E and W boundaries defined by trees/hedgerows; S boundary with residential properties. Road frontage and vehicle, cycle and pedestrian access via Nursery Meadows or Corporation Lane. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential, agricultural and open space |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR169 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Berwick Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.98 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 29 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on NE edge of urban area. Site is bounded by Berwick Rd to W residential properties to S and agricultural land to N and E. Site is currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site has road frontage to Berwick Rd and vehicle/pedestrian/cycle access via Roundhill Lane. Site has some established trees and hedgerows present especially on W and S boundaries. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural land, residential and woodland. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR170 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Shelton Lane, north of Dalton Drive, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.65 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 20 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Small greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary between urban form and River Severn off Shelton Lane. Site is bounded by Shelton La/Severn Way to S, and scrub woodland to N, E and W. Site contains number of established mature trees and on boundaries. Site is accessed by Shelton Lane/Severn Way but is currently not suitable for vehicles at this point. Pedestrian and cycle access also via Shelton Lane/Severn Way. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential and scrub woodland. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR171 |
| Site Address: | Land at Bow Bridge House, Off Mytton Oak Road, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.05 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 31 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | Approx. 10% |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on W edge of Shrewsbury. Site has road frontage with Mytton Oak Rd and has road access via lane to Ley Grange. Pedestrian and cycle access via Mytton Oak Rd to established network. Site is bounded by Mytton Oak Rd to N and access lane to W; allocated housing site SHREW210 to E and agricultural land to S. Site boundaries are defined by established trees and hedgerows to N and E and Bow Brook to E; W with access lane and existing property; S by fence with adjacent agricultural land. Site also contains existing Bow Bridge House and number of existing outbuildings and small pond on E boundary |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural, residential and allotments to W. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Employment: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR172 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Rear of Abbey Car Park, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.69 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 21 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Brownfield site within development boundary. Currently rear area of surfaced car park - car park as a whole has frontage and vehicular access off Abbey Foregate however site itself does not have frontage or access. Site also includes element of scrub land comprised trees/shrubs. Site is bounded by mix of uses including retail to S residential to E and W and car park to N,. Boundaries are clearly defined by neighbouring properties. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Mixed use. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR173 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land west of Ellesmere Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 23.30 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 699 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary between urban form and Shrewsbury - Chester rail line. Site currently in agricultural use for grazing/fodder/arable crops in 5 distinct fields including Hencote Farm and associated buildings in NE corner of site. Site is bounded by rail line to W, Ellesmere Rd to E, Old River Bed LWS to N and residential to S. Boundaries are defined by neighbouring properties and trees hedgerows to N, E and W. Site has road frontage and vehicle access from Ellesmere Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access also via Ellesmere Rd. Likely to be number of established trees and hedgerows within site. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the north and west is primarily agricultural. Character to the east is predominantly residential. Character to the south is a mix of residential/ongoing residential development and other land. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR174 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land West of Ellesmere Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 93.21 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 2796 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 1% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large site consisting of a number of agricultural fields; the Hencott Wood/Pool wildlife site; and Crosshill Farm to the north of Shrewsbury - west of Ellesmere Road. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the north and west is agricultural. Character to the south is primarily agricultural and residential. Character to the east is primarily residential. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR175 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south of Abbey Wharf, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.30 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 69 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of natural/semi-natural open space. The entire site within both flood zone 2 and/or 3. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the north is a mix of residential and commercial. Character to the south and east is also typified by further natural/semi-natural open space. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site forms part of an identified natural/semi-natural open space. The site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. In isolation, the site is landlocked and does not appear to have a road frontage, but there is another site promotion which could provide an access to the site (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR176 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | North of Preston Street, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 29.42 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 883 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 2% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | <p>Large greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on E edge of Shrewsbury between built form and River Severn. Currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops and also contains Weir Hill farm and associated buildings and small site of mobile homes. Site does not have clear road frontage but has junction with and access via Preston Street. Cycle and pedestrian access also via Preston Street to established network. Boundaries with established residential to W; river Severn to E; Shrewsbury- Wolverhampton rail line to N; Robertsford Cottages and access track and further agricultural land to S.. Boundaries are clearly defined and also defined by established trees and hedgerows in parts especially in N and S. Site is bordered by existing residential land and allocated site SHREW027 to S so would be well related to settlement and extend built form to river.</p> |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | <p>Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.</p> <p>Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses.</p> <p>To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.</p> |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²:</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³:</p> |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR177 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Oak Farm, Gains Park, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.45 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 73 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 20 |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Mixed use site outside but adjacent to development boundary on W edge of settlement. Site currently comprises Oak farm, associated buildings and area of agricultural land in use for grazing and fodder crops. Site has road frontage and access to Gains Park Way; cycle and pedestrian access to established networks also from Gains Park Way. Site boundaries are Gains Park Way to E; agricultural land to W and S (SLAA site SHR057) and Bow Brook to N. Site boundaries are clearly defined to E and N by roads, Bow Brook, and residential; to W by existing field boundaries of hedgerows and trees; however S boundary is arbitrary line across existing field. Site would be well related to existing built form. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: Approximately 22% of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3, however the remainder of the site may have development potential. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR178 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Reman Services Sports and Social Club off Albert Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.06 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 62 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 20% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Reman Services Sports and Social Club. Currently comprises social club and entertainment venue, associated parking, bowling green, cricket pitch and associated pavilion and changing and practice facilities. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR179 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | West of Cedars Drive, Ellesmere Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 13.52 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 406 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary between urban form and Shrewsbury - Chester rail line. Site currently in agricultural use for grazing/fodder/arable crops. Site is bounded by agriculture land to W, N and S. Ellesmere Rd to E. Boundaries are defined by neighbouring properties and trees hedgerows to N, E and W. Site has road frontage and vehicle access from Ellesmere Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access also via Ellesmere Rd. Likely to be number of established trees and hedgerows within site. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR180 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land off Cedars Drive, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.40 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 42 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Small greenfield parcel also part of SHR179 and SHR173. Currently in agricultural use for grazing/fodder crops. Access via Cedars Drive but no road frontage. Agricultural land to N, S and W residential properties on Cedars Drive to E. Boundaries defined by trees and hedgerows to N, S and W. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR181 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south west of Ellesmere Road Roundabout, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 42.45 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 1273 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on W edge of settlement. Flat site currently in use for arable/fodder crops. Bounded to N by Huffley La and site SHR174 to W by further agricultural land; to S by Hencott Pool SSSI and RAMSAR site and further agricultural land; to E by Ellesmere Rd and then residential development. Boundaries defined to N and E by road network and to W and S by field boundaries consisting established trees and hedgerows. Site also contains mature trees and hedgerows and small pond in NW corner. Site has road frontage and vehicle access to both Ellesmere Rd and Huffley La. Cycle and pedestrian access via both roads to existing established network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR182 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north of the A5 bypass and south of Pulley Lane, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 3.62 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 108 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on S edge of settlement between Pulley La and A5 bypass. Currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site boundaries set by road network to N, E and S; and with residential properties of Pulley Lane cottages to W. Boundaries defined by trees and hedgerows. Largely flat site with road frontage and access off Pulley La cycle and pedestrian access also from Pulley Lane to existing established network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR183 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | East of Red Barn Lane, off Longden Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.38 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 41 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site within development boundary accessed via Red Barn Lane off Longden Rd, though no road frontage as such. Currently vacant site - informal grassland and some woodland part of extensive wooded area along valley floor. Site boundaries with Rad Brook to N with similar grassland wooded area to E and residential properties on Longden Rd and Red Barn La to S and W. Boundaries defined by mature trees and hedgerows on all sides. No portion of site contains flood zones of Rea Brook. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential and grassland/woodland in private ownership. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR184x |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Underdale Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.01 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of a wooded area and part of an existing dwelling. Site boundaries are undefined. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential and open space. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR185 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north of Dobbies Garden Centre, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.20 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 66 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on S edge of settlement between Pulley La and A5 bypass. Currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site boundaries set by road network to E and S; agricultural land (remainder of field) to N; and with residential properties of Pulley Lane cottages to W. Boundaries defined by trees and hedgerows. Largely flat site with access off Pulley La cottages access road cycle and pedestrian access also from Pulley Lane cottages access road to existing established network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR186 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north east of Ellesmere Road Roundabout, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 3.60 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 108 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site has boundaries with Ellesmere Rd to W; Battlefield link road to S; and adjoining agricultural land to N and E. Boundaries are defined by trees and established hedgerows to N, S and W drainage ditch to E. Site has road frontage with Ellesmere Rd and Battlefield link road and is currently accessed from Battlefield link road. Pedestrian and cycle access via same links to established network |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the north, east and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the south is predominantly commercial. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR187 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south of Hanwood Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 12.29 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 369 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside development boundary to W of Shrewsbury. Currently sub-divided into 3 distinct fields each in agricultural use for pasture/grazing. Site is bounded by Hanwood Rd to N and further agricultural use to S, E, and W. Road frontage and access to Hanwood Rd. No pedestrian access; cycle access via Hanwood Rd to existing network. Boundaries are comprised in part by trees and hedgerows with some additional fencing especially on W and S, also internal boundaries of established trees and hedgerows. Pond on S portion of site. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural land |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR188 |
| Site Address: | West of Longdon Road and South of Nobold |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.80 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 24 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Small greenfield site outside development boundary to W of Shrewsbury and to N of Shrewsbury - Aberystwyth rail line and Longden Rd. Site is currently in agricultural use as grazing/pasture. Site is bounded by rail line and Hanwood Rd to S and E; by residential properties in Nobold to N; and agricultural land to W. Boundaries are clearly defined by trees and hedgerows. Site has road frontage and vehicular access from Longden Rd. There are no pedestrian links, cycle access via Longden Rd to existing network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural and residential |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR189 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land West of Nobold Lane, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 8.22 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 247 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large greenfield site outside development boundary to W of Shrewsbury. Currently used for grazing/pasture. Site is bounded by Nobold La to E; and further agricultural land to W, N and S. Boundaries clearly defined by established trees and hedgerows on all sides. Road frontage and vehicle access to Nobold La. No pedestrian links; cycle links via Nobold La to existing network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR190 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land west of Nobold |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 36.98 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 1110 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large greenfield site outside development boundary to W of Shrewsbury. Currently in agricultural use for grazing/pasture. Site is surrounded by further agricultural land and has boundaries with residential properties in Nobold on SE corner. Site boundaries defined mixture by hedges, trees and fencing. Site has limited road frontage with Nobold La in SE corner and access from surfaced track to Day House farm. No pedestrian access; cycle links via Nobold La to existing network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR191 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Coppice Court, Nobold |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.26 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 8 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Brownfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Small mixed use site outside development boundary to W of Shrewsbury in Nobold. Site comprises residential property of Coppice Court, associated outbuildings and garden area. Site is bounded to N and E by residential properties and to S and W by further agricultural land. Boundaries defined on all sides by established trees and hedgerows. Site has limited road frontage and access to Longden Rd. No pedestrian access; cycle access via Longden Rd to existing network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.5ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR192 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Day House Farm, North of A5, south west of Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 34.76 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 1043 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large greenfield site to W of Shrewsbury outside development boundary. Site currently in agricultural use for grazing/ pasture and fodder crops. Site includes current Day House farm complex and associated buildings. Site is bounded by A5 bypass to W, Newton Farm and farmland to N and further agricultural land to E and S. Site boundaries are not always clearly defined but mixture of hedgerows, trees and fences. Site has road frontage to A5 bypass but otherwise none other and is accessed via surfaced track from Nobold Lane. No pedestrian access; cycle access via Nobold La to existing network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural land |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR193 |
| Site Address: | Land adjacent to the Livestock Market, Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.33 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 70 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside development boundary adjacent to existing livestock market and services at Battlefield roundabout. Site is currently in agricultural use for grazing. Site has road frontage and vehicular access to A49 and is also accessed from rear of livestock market. No pedestrian links; cycle links via A49/A53 to existing network. Site bounded by A49 to W; Calder's House residential property to N; livestock market and commercial services to S; further agriculture land to E. N, E, and S boundaries defined by hedgerows and mature trees; W boundary comprised scrub hedge and fencing. |
| Surrounding Character: | Mixed. Single residential property to N further agricultural land to W and E and livestock market, offices, retail and pub/hotel to S. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Employment: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR194 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | North of the A5, north west of Pulley Lane, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 13.21 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 396 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large greenfield site outside development boundary to S of Shrewsbury. Site is adjacent to Shrewsbury built form but not development boundary due to Bestune Way exceptions site to E. Site lies in gap between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill bounded by A5 bypass and Pulley La to S; Rea Brook and flood zone to N and W; Bestune Way affordable exceptions site to E. Site boundaries are defined by established trees and hedgerows on all sides. Site has road frontage and vehicle access off Pulley Lane. Pedestrian and cycle links and access via Pulley Lane to existing networks. Site was considered by Inspector of 14/05655/OUT to lie in the "gap of undeveloped land between Bayston Hill and Meole Brace" SAMDev policy S16.2(ii) |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the south and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north and east is a mix of residential and agricultural. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR195 |
| Site Address: | Land at Shawbury Turn (A49/A53/A5124 junction), Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 5.03 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 151 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on N boundary of Shrewsbury to NW of Battlefield roundabout. Site currently in agricultural use for fodder/arable crops. Site has road frontage and vehicle access from A49. Pedestrian/cycle access and links via A49 (pavement) to existing established networks. Site is bounded by Shrewsbury-Crewe rail line to W; A5124 to S; A49 to E; Battlefield site access road and further agriculture land to N. Boundaries defined by established hedgerows and occasional mature trees on W and S and by established hedgerows and fencing to E and N. |
| Surrounding Character: | Roads and rail links then agricultural land, residential properties and livestock market and commercial area to E. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Employment: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR196 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Nobold House, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 31.97 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 959 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 5% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site to W of Shrewsbury part adjacent to development boundary. Site is currently in general agricultural use primarily for grazing and fodder crops, although landscape has parkland appearance for much of site. Site has 2 distinct parcels: smaller N section to N of Hanwood Rd comprising farmland and farm complex of Oakfield's and residential property of Oakfield's. S of Hanwood Rd and W of Nobold La is larger element comprised of land around and properties of Nobold House and Nobold House Cottage. Site also includes part of site of brickworks and former clay pit off Hanwood Rd. Site is bounded by Nobold Lane to E; access track to Day House Farm to S; farmland to W and N; and NE corner with residential estate development. Site boundaries are defined by established trees and hedgerows with some additional fencing in places. Site contains many established trees and hedgerows for amenity value and as internal boundaries, also includes sizeable pond in S portion of site. Site has road and vehicle access to Nobold Lane and Hanwood Rd. Pedestrian and cycle links via both to existing established network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and open space; residential to NE. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR197 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south east of Battlefield Roundabout, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 32.83 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 985 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large greenfield site adjacent to development boundary on NE corner of Shrewsbury. Currently in agricultural use for grazing/fodder crops. Site is split into 5 distinct field subdivided by established trees and hedgerows. Site is bounded by agricultural land and A53 to N, further agricultural land to E and S and by A49 bypass and residential development to W. Site boundaries are comprised largely of established trees and hedgerows on all sides and site also contains a number of small ponds. Site has road frontage and vehicle access onto A53. There are no pedestrian links currently and cycle access is via A53 to established network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR197VAR |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south east of Battlefield Roundabout, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 7.20 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 216 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | An agricultural field located adjacent to development boundary on north-east corner of Shrewsbury. Site boundaries consist of the A53 to the north, the A49 bypass to the west and agricultural field boundaries to east and south. Site has road frontage and vehicle access onto A53. There are no pedestrian links currently and cycle access is via A53 to established network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and commercial. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | N/A |
| <i>Employment:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR198 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north east of the Livestock Market and north east of Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 48.89 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 1467 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of a series of agricultural fields located to the north east of the Livestock Market and north of the A53. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, with the exception of the adjacent livestock market/employment site and a small number of rural dwellings. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR199 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land east of Ferry House, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 9.36 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 281 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of two agricultural fields bounded by the railway line to the north, river on part of its western boundary and A5 to the east and south. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR200 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land adjacent to Ellesmere Road, opposite Mount Pleasant Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 6.18 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 185 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of part of an agricultural field located to the west of Ellesmere Road. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the north, south and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is predominantly residential. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR201 |
| Site Address: | Land east of the Cattle Market, north east of Shrewsbury |
| Settlement: | Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 4.92 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 148 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of part of an agricultural field located to the east of the cattle market. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north, east and south is primarily agricultural. Character to the east is predominantly employment (cattle market and associated uses). |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability ¹ : Size ² : As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Strategic Suitability ³ : In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR203 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land West of Battlefield Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.58 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 77 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Part of an agricultural field located to the rear of several commercial properties and a public house. The site is also located to the north of a large factory building. The site is allocated for employment development. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the north is predominantly agricultural (allocated for residential development). Character to the east is predominantly commercial. Character to the south is also commercial, with the adjacent factory building and associated facility a key feature. Character to the west is also commercial (although the site is separated from this area by the railway line). |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR204 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land east of Battlefield Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.13 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 64 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site is approximately triangular shaped, located to the south of Battlefield Roundabout. It is bordered by the A512 to the west, the A49 to the east and a residential curtilage/coppice to the south. The site is allocated for employment development. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the east is primarily agricultural. Character to the south is a mixture of residential and coppiced woodland. Character to the west is residential beyond which is agricultural (allocated for residential). Character to the north is a mixture of agricultural and commercial. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR205 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Shrewsbury West SUE - Churncote South, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.18 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 65 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site is part of an agricultural field located to the south east of Churncote Roundabout, east of the A5 and south of the A458. The site represents part of the Shrewsbury West Sustainable Urban Extension. The site is allocated for employment development. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. However land to the south and east has been allocated for development (mixed use development). |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR206 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Shrewsbury West SUE - Oxon Business Park Phase 2, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 4.94 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 148 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Series of agricultural fields forming a linear site to the north of Shrewsbury. The sites northern boundary is formed by the proposed route of the Oxon Link Road. The site is allocated for employment development. The site forms part of the Shrewsbury West Sustainable Urban Extension. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the north and west is predominantly agricultural (allocated for mixed use development), there is also housing, retail and a park and ride to the west. Character to the east is predominantly agricultural. Character to the south is a mix of residential, commercial and agricultural. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR207 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Shrewsbury West SUE - North of Oxon Link Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 10.00 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 300 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large site consisting of parts of a number of agricultural fields. The site is formed by Holyhead Road to the east, the route of the Oxon Link Road to the south, and a caravan site/grounds of Oxon Hall and the Severn Hospice to the north. The site is allocated for employment development. The site forms part of the Shrewsbury West Sustainable Urban Extension. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the east is predominantly agricultural. Character to the south is agricultural (land allocated for employment development) beyond which the character is commercial. Character to the west is agricultural (land allocated for mixed use development). Character to the north is a mix of leisure and community care. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR208 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Shrewsbury West SUE - Churncote North, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.17 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 35 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Triangular site, representing part of an agricultural field. The site is bounded by the A458 (Welshpool Road) to the south; Calcott Lane to the east; and the proposed route of the Oxon Link Road to the North. The site has been allocated for employment development. The site represents part of the Shrewsbury West Sustainable Urban Extension. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, although land to the south and east has been allocated for mixed use development. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR209 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land North of A5/A458 Welshpool Road Roundabout, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 6.95 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 208 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | An irregularly shaped site consisting of parts of two agricultural fields, located to the north of Welshpool Road Roundabout. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding uses are primarily agricultural and residential. Land to the east of the site is allocated for mixed use development. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR210 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north of Oxon Business Park, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.22 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 37 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approximately 25% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of part of an agricultural field and an area in employment use associated with the adjacent employment site. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding character is a mix of agricultural and commercial. Much of the adjacent agricultural land is allocated for employment development. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR211 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Hollydene, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.45 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 14 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 25% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of a large dwelling and its curtilage. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding character is predominantly residential. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³:</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR212 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land east of Sundorne Pool, East of Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 3.70 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 111 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of an agricultural field located to the east Sundorne Pool and north of the B5062. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding uses are predominantly agricultural. However the site is located adjacent to the Severn Acres Sports Centre. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is separated from the built form of the settlement. The element of the site closest to the built form of the settlement is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. The site contains a small portion of a local wildlife site. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR213 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Underdale, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 14.96 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 449 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of a series of agricultural fields located within a loop of the river severn. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding uses are a mix of residential, agricultural and leisure (a golf driving range). |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR215 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land adjacent to Salop Leisure, Emstrey Bank, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.18 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 65 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside development boundary. Part of the site is in agricultural use, the remainder of the site forms part of the landscaping associated with the touring caravan site and fishing pond to the south. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | To the north and east land uses are predominantly agricultural. To the south land uses are predominantly leisure based (caravan site and fishing pond). To the west land uses are commercial (caravan sales at Salop Leisure). |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: The site is isolated from the built form of the settlement. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR216 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land East of Holyhead Road, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 23.15 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 695 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | A large site consisting of a number of agricultural fields located to the north of Shelton Lane, east of Holyhead Road, west of the river severn and south of Spring Coppice. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to north and east is predominantly agricultural. Character to the south is a mix of wooded areas and residential development. Character to the west is mixed, including agricultural land (much of which is allocated for mixed use development), healthcare facilities, employment facilities. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR217 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | The Pitch and Putt, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 3.26 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 98 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 50% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of the Shrewsbury Pitch and Putt Site, and Bannatynes Health Club. The site is bounded by Hazeldine Way to the north, Oteley Road to the south, Meole Brace roundabout to the west and the railway line to the east. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding uses are varied, including open space (golf course), residential, commercial and retail. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Currently Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR218 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Telford Way, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 3.88 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 116 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | Approx. 15% |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of the Shrewsbury Golf Driving Range building and parts of its curtilage land. The sites southern boundary is defined by Telford Way, its eastern, northern and western boundaries are undefined on the ground, seeking to reflect the extent of flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding uses include the remainder of the driving range, agricultural land and residential properties. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | N/A |
| <i>Employment:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR219 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land west of Nobold |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 82.60 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 2478 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large number of agricultural fields located to the west of Nobold. Site boundaries are defined by the A5 to the west and south; Roman Road and agricultural field boundaries to the north; and agricultural field boundaries and properties in Nobold to the east. (Site consists of SHR025, SHR149, SHR190 and SHR192). |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding uses include agricultural land and residential properties. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> <i>Employment:</i> | N/A N/A |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR221 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | South of Mytton Oak Road, off Goosehill, Shrewsbury |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 10.15 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 305 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site consists of a series of agricultural fields forming a linear site south of Mutton Oak Road. In isolation the sites only road frontage is off Goosehill. Site boundaries are defined by Goosehill to the west, and agricultural field boundaries for the remainder. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | The site abuts an existing residential development site to the north-west. Remaining surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, with a series of rural dwellings along Goosehill to the west and allotments to the north-west. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | N/A N/A |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SLC002 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at the Cottage, Calcott Lane, Calcott |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Calcott near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.54 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 76 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of a series of small agricultural fields, a wooded area and a large rural dwelling. Boundaries are primarily hedgerow boundaries. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential to the north, agricultural and woodland to south, east and west. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| | Due to the sites location it was screened out of the SLAA. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Calcott than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SLC003 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Calcott Lane, Calcott |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Calcott near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.70 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 21 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of one whole and part of a second agricultural field located to the south of Calcott. Boundaries are primarily agricultural field boundary, apart from that which divides the second agricultural field. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential to the north-west, agricultural and woodland to north-east, east, south and south-west. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | Due to the sites location it was screened out of the SLAA. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Calcott than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | UFF001 |
| Site Address: | Land west of Gables Farm, Uffington |
| Settlement: | Uffington near Shrewsbury |
| Site Size (Ha): | 4.5 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 134 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | Approximately 10% |
| General Description: | The site consists of a large and linear agricultural field located to the north of Uffington. Site boundaries are predominantly agricultural field boundaries. |
| Surrounding Character: | Primarily agricultural with some rural dwellings. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability ¹ : Size ² : |
| | Strategic Suitability ³ : |
| | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | UFF002 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land adjacent to the canal, Uffington |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Uffington near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.8 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 55 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of two agricultural fields, which are somewhat detached from the built form of Uffington. Site boundaries are agricultural field boundaries. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: Due to the sites location it was screened out of the SLAA. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Uffington than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | UFF003X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at The Old Malt House, Uffington |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Uffington near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.1 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Residential garden plot. Site boundaries are defined by field boundaries, the road and the associated dwelling. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential and agricultural. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | N/A |
| <i>Employment:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for either residential and/or employment development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.2ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: Due to the sites location it was screened out of the SLAA. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Uffington than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | UFF004 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Uffington |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Uffington near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.7 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 20 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of a field located to the rear of properties fronting onto Church Road. The site has no obvious road frontage. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural to the south. Residential to the east. The river is to the west. To the north are various land uses including open space, scrubland and the river. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Strategic Suitability³: | Due to the sites location it was screened out of the SLAA. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Uffington than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | UFF005 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Bridge Farm, Uffington |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Uffington near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.6 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 48 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of a rectangular agricultural field located to the south of Uffington. Site boundaries are defined by agricultural field boundaries. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Primarily agricultural, although there are large rural dwellings on large plots to the north and farm buildings to the east. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| | Due to the sites location it was screened out of the SLAA. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Uffington than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | UFF006 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Rear of hall opposite Mill Lane, Uffington |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Uffington near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.9 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 58 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | An irregularly shaped site consisting of a series of agricultural fields wrapping around properties in Uffington. Site boundaries consists of agricultural field boundaries, wooded belts and property curtilages. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the east is agricultural. Character to the north is a mix of woodland, agricultural and residential. Character to the west is residential. Character to the south is a mix of residential and agricultural. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | Due to the sites location it was screened out of the SLAA. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Uffington than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | UFF007 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land North of Bridge Farm, Uffington |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Uffington near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.1 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 34 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of a series of agricultural fields to the south of Uffington. Site boundaries are defined by agricultural field boundaries. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Primarily agricultural, although there are large dwellings to the west and north and a farm complex to the south. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: |
| Strategic Suitability³: | Due to the sites location it was screened out of the SLAA. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Uffington than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | UFF008 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Adjoining Church Road, Uffington |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Uffington near Shrewsbury |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.5 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 14 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of a rectangular strip of an agricultural field. The sites eastern boundary is defined by property curtilages, northern boundary by the road, southern boundary by an agricultural field boundary, western boundary is undefined running through an agricultural field. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Primarily agricultural to north, west and south. Residential to east. |
| <i>Suitability Information: Residential:</i> <i>(from SLAA) Employment:</i> | Not Suitable |
| | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information ¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: Due to the sites location it was screened out of the SLAA. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Uffington than Shrewsbury. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Community Hub: Baschurch

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP003 |
| Site Address: | Village Hall playing fields, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.37 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 71 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Playing and sports fields adjacent to village hall and development boundary. Currently used as playing pitches and open space. Site is adjacent to village hall and secondary school and playing fields to W and has agricultural land to E and S; N is allocated housing site BAS035. Boundaries are clearly defined with adjacent development or otherwise by established hedgerows. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access from Eyton Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via Eyton Lane to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural and open countryside. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The majority of the site is an identified public open space. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP005 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Eyton Lane, adjoining the Village Hall, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.37 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 41 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Playing and sports fields adjacent to village hall and development boundary. Currently used as playing pitches and open space. Site is adjacent to village hall and secondary school and playing fields to W and has agricultural land to E and S; N is further playing field land and allocated housing site BAS035. Boundaries are clearly defined with adjacent development or otherwise by established hedgerows. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access from Eyton Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via Eyton Lane to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural and open countryside. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The majority of the site is an identified public open space. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP006 |
| Site Address: | School Playing Fields, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.80 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 114 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Playing fields to rear of Corbet School (secondary) containing hard surface games courts, cricket practice facilities etc. Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary to NW of settlement. Site is currently recreational use by secondary school although not in SC ownership. Site has boundary with secondary school to S and residential to W and NW; to N is allocated housing site BAS035; to E with village playing fields. Defined boundaries with built development to E and S and by trees and hedgerows on N and W. Site has no road frontage and vehicle access is currently through school. Pedestrian and cycle access via Eyton Lane to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Open space, residential and school development |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The majority of the site is an identified public open space. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP007 |
| Site Address: | Land North-East of Wheatland's Estate, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.03 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 91 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary to rear of Kings Drive. Site currently in agricultural use. Site has residential development of Wheatland's estate to E and agricultural land to N, W, and S. Boundaries are clearly defined with residential properties to E and by trees and hedgerows to N and S; boundary to W is not clearly defined. Site does not have road frontage and current vehicle access is not obvious, although access could be via Kings Drive estate in future. Pedestrian and cycle access via Wheatland's estate to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural and residential |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP008 |
| Site Address: | Land south of Nobold, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 4.43 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 133 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on W side of settlement. Site is currently in agricultural use as rough grazing. Site has residential development to N, E, SE and NW and agricultural use to SW and S. Site boundaries are clearly defined by hedgerows and trees on N W, and S boundaries and by fencing to E on road frontage. Site has watercourse along W boundary. Site has road frontage to NE with Nobold and to E with Shrewsbury Rd. Vehicle access is currently via Shrewsbury Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access also via Shrewsbury Rd or Nobold to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Mix of residential and agricultural land |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP009 |
| Site Address: | Land north of The Mount, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 10.12 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 304 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large greenfield site outside and away from development boundary and built form of village. Site is currently in agricultural use for arable crops. Site is surrounded by farmland in active agricultural use with 2 single dwellings on S and W corners of site. Site boundaries are clearly defined by Shrewsbury-Chester rail line on W boundary, hedgerows and scattered trees on N and S boundaries and road to Weston Lullingfields on W boundary. Site has road frontage and vehicle access to Weston Lullingfields Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access via same road however site is some distance from village and no pavement present. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural use/farmland |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP010 |
| Site Address: | Land east of Old Farm Cottage, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.41 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 12 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site currently in agricultural use as small, paddock and for rough grazing. Outside but adjacent to development boundary and containing part of conservation area. Site has agricultural use to N, E and S and residential use to W. W element of site contains redundant agricultural buildings. Site boundaries are clearly defined by neighbouring properties and trees/hedgerows apart from N boundary which is not discernible on the ground. Site does not have road frontage but vehicle access is via driveway from Shrewsbury Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access via Shrewsbury Rd to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Mixed agricultural and residential |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP011 |
| Site Address: | Ivy Patch, Prescott, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.24 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 7 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | 20% |
| General Description: | Part brownfield site 70% within development boundary. Site includes property (Ivy Patch) garden area and paddock in use as rough grazing. Site is within conservation area. Site has residential properties to N and W and agricultural land to S and E. Boundaries are clearly defined on all sides with neighbouring residential properties and by trees and hedgerows with adjacent farmland. Site does not have road frontage but vehicle access is via surfaced driveway from Shrewsbury Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access via Shrewsbury Rd to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Farmland and residential |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP012 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land adjacent to old farm cottage, Baschurch |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Baschurch |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.57 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 17 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site currently in agricultural use as small, paddock and for rough grazing. Outside but adjacent to development boundary and containing part of conservation area. Site has agricultural use to N, E and S and residential use to W. W element of site contains redundant agricultural buildings. Site boundaries are clearly defined by neighbouring properties and trees/hedgerows. Site does not have road frontage but vehicle access is via driveway from Shrewsbury Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access via Shrewsbury Rd to existing established network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Mixed agricultural and residential |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP014 |
| Site Address: | Newtown Garage, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.24 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 7 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Brownfield site within development boundary. Currently in use as car/motor service and repair garage and associated car parking/ storage with convenience store to S and residential on all other sides. Boundaries clearly defined by neighbouring properties and roads. Site has road frontage and vehicle access to Shrewsbury Rd. W portion of site included in Conservation Area. Pedestrian and cycle access via Shrewsbury Rd to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP017 |
| Site Address: | Land north of the B4397, adjoining Stony Yard, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 18.23 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 547 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on N side of settlement. Site is currently in agricultural use for arable crops. Site has residential development of Baschurch, Stony Yard exceptions site and B4397 on S boundary and agricultural farmland on other 3 sides. Boundaries comprised trees and hedgerows on W and N boundaries and open boundaries with roads on S and E sides. Site has extensive road frontage on W, E and S boundaries and current vehicle access via lane to Stanwardine. Cycle and Pedestrian access via pavement and B4397 to existing established network. Part of S element of site subject to application in 2016 for 20 dwellings refused and dismissed due to inappropriate location, pattern of development and conflict with adopted plan. |
| Surrounding Character: | Predominantly agricultural and open countryside except residential development to S. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP021 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land to the south of Eyton Lane, Baschurch |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Baschurch |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 12.43 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 373 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Site lies to S of Eyton Lane opposite village hall and site BNP003. Site is adjoined by agricultural land to S, N and W with village hall and playing fields to N and residential estate development to W. Site boundaries are comprised of poorly maintained hedgerows with gaps on N, E, and S boundaries. Site has road frontage and current highway access to Eyton Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via Eyton Lane to existing established network. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural and mix of residential/community development |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP022 |
| Site Address: | Land east of Kings Drive, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.01 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 60 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary to rear of Kings Drive. Site currently in agricultural use. Site has residential development of Wheatland's estate to E and agricultural land to N, W, and S. Boundaries are clearly defined with residential properties to E and by trees and hedgerows to N and S; boundary to W is not clearly defined. Site does not have road frontage and current vehicle access is not obvious, although access could be via Kings Drive estate in future. Pedestrian and cycle access via Wheatland's estate to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural and residential |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP023 |
| Site Address: | Land to the west side of Shrewsbury Road, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.36 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 71 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on W side of settlement. Site is currently in agricultural use as rough grazing. Site has residential development to N, E, SE and NW and agricultural use to SW and S. Site boundaries are clearly defined by hedgerows and trees on N W, and S boundaries and by fencing to E on road frontage. Site has road frontage to NE with Nobold and to E with Shrewsbury Rd. Vehicle access is currently via Shrewsbury Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access also via Shrewsbury Rd or Nobold to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Mix of residential and agricultural land |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP024 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land to the north side of Milford Road, Baschurch |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Baschurch |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 3.07 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 92 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Large greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on W of settlement. Currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site adjoins allocated site BAS017 to E and recent residential development to S at Prescott Equestrian Centre. Site has further agricultural land to N and W. Site has hedgerow boundaries to W, N and S but no discernible boundary to E. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to Milford Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access via Milford Rd although no pavement currently on Milford Rd. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Mixed residential and agricultural |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Conclusion: Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP030X |
| Site Address: | Admiral Duncan Inn, Newtown |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.09 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site below size threshold |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | N/A |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA.</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP031X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south of Ivy Patch |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Baschurch |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.19 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| Strategic Suitability³: | As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP033 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Greenways, Walford Road, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.23 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 37 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary S end of settlement. Currently in agricultural use as paddock/grazing land. Site has residential properties on W boundary and wraps around individual property of Greenways on S boundary. Further agricultural uses to N, E, and W. Boundaries appear to be clearly defined around most of site by established hedgerows and trees with possible exception of NW corner where appears to be arbitrary line. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to B5067. Pedestrian and cycle access via B5067 to existing established network although no pavement currently along this stretch of B5067. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural with some residential to W. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP034a |
| Site Address: | Land off Station Road, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.64 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 79 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | 7% |
| General Description: | Mixed site, mostly greenfield including properties of Marne House and Holly View - approx. 7% brownfield. Site outside but adjoining development boundary at N end of settlement. Currently in agricultural use for grazing/fodder crops and residential use. Residential to N and W and agricultural use currently to S and E. However S is allocated site BAS035 and E are pp 14/02286/OUT & 17/02174/REM for 48 dwellings. Site does not have road frontage as such, current vehicle access is via access for Holly View to Station Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access via same access to Station Rd and existing established links. Site boundaries are clearly defined by hedgerows and trees on all sides also hedgerows within site marking internal field boundaries. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential and agricultural |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP035 |
| Site Address: | Land to East of Prescott Fields, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.16 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 35 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjoining development boundary on E side of settlement. Currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site has residential estate development of Prescott Fields to W and agricultural uses to N E and S although S is SAMDev allocated housing site BAS025. Site has defined boundaries with residential use to W and hedgerows/trees to S but N and E boundaries are not discernible appear to be arbitrary lines. Site is accessed via surface track from Shrewsbury Rd but has no road frontage. Pedestrian and cycle access also via track to Shrewsbury Rd and then to existing established network |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential and agricultural |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP036 |
| Site Address: | Rear Prescott Court, off Perryfield Road, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.91 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 57 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside and not adjoining development boundary on SW periphery of settlement. Currently in agricultural use for arable crops. Site does adjoin recent estate development of Perryfields to E agricultural land and large pond to N and further agricultural land to S and W. Boundaries to N and E are clearly defined by trees /hedgerows and residential properties; to S and W not discernible on the ground. Site does not have road frontage and current vehicle access via site BNP037 to Yeaton Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access also via Yeaton Lane although no pavement currently to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential and agricultural |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP037 |
| Site Address: | South of Prescott Court, off Prescott Road, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.60 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 78 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside and not adjoining development boundary on SW periphery of settlement. Currently in agricultural use for arable crops. Site does adjoin recent estate development of Perryfields to E agricultural land and large pond to N and further agricultural land to S and W. Boundaries to N and E are clearly defined by trees /hedgerows and residential properties; to S and W not discernible on the ground. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access via site BNP037 to Yeaton Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access also via Yeaton Lane although no pavement currently to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential and agricultural |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP037VAR |
| Site Address: | South of Prescott Court, off Prescott Road, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.78 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 53 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside and not adjoining development boundary on SW periphery of settlement. Currently in agricultural use for arable crops. Site does adjoin recent estate development of Perryfields to E agricultural land and large pond to N and further agricultural land to S and W. Boundaries to N and E are clearly defined by trees / hedgerows and residential properties; to S and W not discernible on the ground. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to Yeaton Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access also via Yeaton Lane although no pavement currently to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential and agricultural |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | N/A |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP038 |
| Site Address: | South of the B5067, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 7.00 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 210 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjoining development boundary on S periphery of settlement. Site is currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site has some residential to NW corner but is otherwise surrounded by agricultural land. Site boundaries to N, W and EW are clearly defined by trees/hedgerows but extensive S boundary is not discernible on ground appears to be arbitrary line. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access off B5067 pedestrian and cycle access via same route although no pavement on B5067. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural and open countryside. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP039 |
| Site Address: | Land West of The Cedars adjacent Prescott Farm, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.43 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 13 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Brownfield site part of former equestrian centre - former practice area, storage and access road. Adjoining development boundary on W of settlement. Site has residential development to S, W and E with greenfield site in agricultural use for grazing/paddock to N. Site boundaries are clearly defined with adjoining residential properties and established trees/hedgerow on E boundary. N boundary marked by post and wire fencing. Site has no road frontage as such but current vehicle access is via Prescott Court. Cycle and pedestrian access also via Prescott Court to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential with agricultural land to N |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP040 |
| Site Address: | Walford Road, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.64 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 79 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | 15% |
| General Description: | Large greenfield site outside but adjoining development boundary on SE corner of settlement. Site includes BNP033 Used for equestrian purposes and for grazing of horses. Currently in agricultural use as paddock/grazing land. Site has residential properties on W boundary and wraps around individual property of Greenways on S boundary. Further agricultural uses to N, E, and W. Boundaries appear to be clearly defined around most of site by established hedgerows and trees with possible exception of NW corner where appears to be arbitrary line. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to B5067. Pedestrian and cycle access via B5067 to existing established network although no pavement currently along this stretch of B5067. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural with some residential to W. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP041 |
| Site Address: | Land off Station Road, Baschurch |
| Settlement: | Baschurch |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.40 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 72 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjoining development boundary at N end of settlement. Also part of site BNP034a Currently in agricultural use for grazing/fodder crops. Residential to N and W and agricultural use currently to S and E. However S is allocated site BAS035 and E are pp 14/02286/OUT & 17/02174/REM for 48 dwellings. Site does not have road frontage as such, current vehicle access is via access for Holly View to Station Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access via same access to Station Rd and existing established links. Site boundaries are clearly defined by hedgerows and trees on all sides also hedgerows within site marking internal field boundaries. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural and residential |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Community Hub: Bayston Hill

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY001 |
| Site Address: | Pulley Farm, Pulley Lane, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.96 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 29 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site comprises a brick built farm house and a number of brick-built ancillary buildings within the farmyard area and curtilage. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is surrounded by a number of fields in agricultural use. On the opposite of the site is a reclaimed waste site which is grassed. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is located within the Green Gap between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill. The site is remote from the built form of the settlement, separated by land that has not been promoted for consideration. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY002 |
| Site Address: | The Fields, Pulley Lane, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.18 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 6 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site comprises a field in agricultural use (grazing) at the end of Pulley Lane and south of the A5. |
| Surrounding Character: | Land to the east and west is in agricultural use, the A5 runs along the northern boundary and there is a group of 3 houses to the south. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The site is located within the Green Gap between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill. The site is remote from the built form of the settlement, separated by land that has not been promoted for consideration. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY003 |
| Site Address: | South of Windy Ridge, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 29.51 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 885 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A large site lying to the west of Bayston Hill which is formed by an undulating area of agricultural land which slopes markedly down to the Rea Brook. The site is separated from the settlement of Bayston Hill by additional agricultural land and an area of open space (Lythwood). There is a history of coal mining in the area; as such there are a number of Development High Risk areas on the site. The site is not adjacent to the development boundary |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is surrounded by other agricultural land and an area of open space known as Lythwood. Immediately between the site and the Rea Brook is the settlement of Hook-a-Gate |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is located within the Green Gap between Bayston Hill and Hook-a-gate. In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement. Whilst there are other site promotions within this area of separation, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY005 |
| Site Address: | North-east of Gorse Lane, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.50 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 75 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | This site is formed of two fields separated by established hedgerows and is currently used for agricultural purposes. The site is largely set to grass with a number of trees being present. The site falls behind the development to the northern side of Gorse Lane |
| Surrounding Character: | Gorse Lane and the single depth residential development along its length is to the south western side of the site. The south eastern side of the site and northern side of the site are adjacent to land currently used for agricultural purposes with much of the land to the immediate north of the site having been used historically for landfill. The entirety of the site except for its access point falls outside the development boundary. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY006 |
| Site Address: | White House south, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.90 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 57 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is formed of the front element of a field adjacent to Lyth Hill Rd the depth of which from the road varies between 60-80metres. The site is currently in agricultural use and falls from the south west to the north east. The site falls outside of the Bayston Hill development boundary |
| Surrounding Character: | On the opposite side of Lyth Hill Road to the site is a single depth run of dwellings in a ribbon development form whilst to the immediate north is a further residential property "White House". The remainder of the surrounding area is agricultural in nature. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY008 |
| Site Address: | East of New House, Hereford Road, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.32 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 40 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is formed of part of a gently undulating field currently used for agricultural purposes. The site is bounded by Burgs Lane to the east, a single dwelling in a large plot to the north, the remainder of the field to the south and to the west partly by the A49 and partly by a further dwelling and its curtilage. The site and the two adjacent properties fall outside of the development boundary. |
| Surrounding Character: | To the south the site is bounded by agricultural land. The remainder is bounded by the A49 and Burgs Lane which have some development on their opposite side. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY009 |
| Site Address: | North of allotments, east of Hereford Road, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 16.14 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 484 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | This site lies to the south of the A5 and immediately to the east of the A49 extending as far as Sharpstone Lane. The land is flat in character and used for agricultural purposes. A stream flows through the site, as such approximately 25% of the site falls into Flood Zones 2&3. This isolates an area to the east of the site of approx 2.6 ha of land away from the remainder (approx 9.5ha) of the site's land not affected by Flood Zone. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is bounded to the west by the A49 on the other side of which is a service station for the A5/A49, garden centre and agricultural land. To the north, on the other side of the (elevated) A5 is the Meole Brace Park and Ride. The site is bounded to the east by a railway line to the other side of which is agricultural land and then a quarry. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY010 |
| Site Address: | Hollies Drive south-east, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 5.17 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 155 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | This site is adjacent to the Bayston Hill development boundary but falls outside of it. The site which lies to the north of Bayston Hill is formed of the western portion of a field, is in agricultural use and slopes down from the south west to the north east. |
| Surrounding Character: | To the west and the south the site is bounded by residential development. To the north west, north and east the site is bounded by fields in current agricultural use. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: This site in isolation has no road frontage or potential point of access. However, there are other promoted sites which could provide this site a road frontage (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY011 |
| Site Address: | Hollies Drive north east, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.80 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 114 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside development boundary of Bayston Hill. Site lies to NE of Bayston Hill and is currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Boundaries are clearly defined by adjacent fields to E and S marked by hedgerows and trees; to W boundary is with established estate development in Bayston Hill and N with Pulley Lane. Site has road frontage and access to Pulley Lane; pedestrian access good along existing footway on Pulley Lane to Bayston Hill. Opposite Pulley Ridge development |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural and residential |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY013 |
| Site Address: | 29 Gorse Lane, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.70 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 21 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is formed of a 1970s (approx) built bungalow, its immediate curtilage and a small field behind currently used for grazing horses. The site appears to be reasonably flat in nature. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is bounded to the north east by its frontage onto Gorse Lane on the opposite side of which is residential development. Further residential development lies adjacent to the side of the site on both its south east/south boundaries. Behind the properties on Gorse Lane to the property's north west boundary lies an area of apparently vacant land. The west is bounded by woodland. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY015X |
| Site Address: | Land off Sharpstokes Lane |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.19 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | boundary amended 2017 |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY017 |
| Site Address: | Ivy House north, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 7.76 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 233 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | An extensive site to the west of Bayston Hill that is currently used for outdoor leisure, sports and open space purposes. The site adjoins the built form of Bayston Hill to its eastern boundaries but falls outside of the Bayston Hill Development boundary. |
| Surrounding Character: | The north east of the site lies adjacent to the built form of Bayston Hill whilst to the north is an area of woodland. Skirting round the east and south east of the site are a variety of leisure uses including a sports centre and outdoor sports facilities. The remainder of the site is bounded by agricultural land. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The majority of the site is identified as natural/semi-natural open space. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY018X |
| Site Address: | land at Brookfield, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.05 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA.</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY019 |
| Site Address: | Pinewood south, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.18 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 5 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Wooded linear site off Lythwood Road. The site is in use for public uses |
| Surrounding Character: | The site adjoins a high density residential area on the south west of Bayston Hill. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.2ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY022 |
| Site Address: | Lythwood Grange east, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 5.55 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 167 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is formed of the middle section of a large field in agricultural use. The site slopes upwards from north to south. The site is bounded to the north west by the access road to Lythwood Farm. The site sits outside of the development boundary which it touches a point of at either end of its northern boundary. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is mainly neighboured to the north, east and south by agricultural land. On the opposite side of the access road to Lythwood farm which forms the sites western boundary are the Lythwood Allotments. At either end of the northern boundary the site has a point of contact with the development boundary but the land immediately to the north of the site (BAY026) is still in agricultural use. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY023 |
| Site Address: | Pulley Lane west and A5 south, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 16.50 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 495 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | This large site formed from part of a single field lies to the north but some distance away from Bayston Hill with a long frontage (approx 750m) to the A5 and a significant frontage of approx 370m to Pulley Lane. The site is currently used for agricultural purposes. Much of the western portion of the site (25% of total surface area) is a reclaimed waste site. |
| Surrounding Character: | The surrounding land is used for agricultural purposes. To the north of the site is a long frontage onto the A5 (750m) to the opposite side of which is further agricultural land. The eastern boundary is formed by Pulley Lane to the other side of which is further agricultural land. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is located within the Green Gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury. In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY024X |
| Site Address: | Land at Pulley House, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.11 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY025 |
| Site Address: | Hanley Lane west, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 6.19 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 186 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A large irregularly shaped site that sits adjacent to the built form of Bayston Hill to its east. The site is currently use for agriculture spanning parts of four fields. The site slopes from south to north towards Rea Brook |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is bounded to the east by the built form of Bayston Hill, to the north east by a stretch of woodland. The remainder of the site is bounded by agriculture. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is located within the Green Gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury. This site in isolation has no road frontage or potential point of access. However, there are other promoted sites which could provide this site a road frontage (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY026 |
| Site Address: | Glebe Road south west, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.79 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 84 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is formed of the northern section of a large field adjacent to the built form of Bayston Hill and is currently used for agriculture. The site is roughly triangular in shape and, if developed, would smooth the settlement's shape of built form. The site falls outside the development boundary. The site slopes gently upwards north to south. |
| Surrounding Character: | To the south west of the site is agricultural land (site BAY022). The remainder of the site is bounded by existing residential development. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY027 |
| Site Address: | Redhill Drive north, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 6.79 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 204 |
| Type of Site: | Not Known |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is formed of a long thin triangular piece of land amounting to 7ha that was once occupied by railway sidings and welding sheds which became disused in 1960 and were dismantled. The ground has now returned to a natural state and is now in appearance an area of scrubland between woodland areas. The site is therefore not categorised as brownfield. The site is elevated above neighbouring residential area at Redhill. The site is located 500m to the north of Hook-a-Gate, 500m to the north west of Bayston Hill and 1km to the south west of Shrewsbury to the south of the A5 and a railway line. |
| Surrounding Character: | The surrounding area is predominantly agricultural although to the south east of the site are a small number of dwellings on Redhill Drive above which the site is elevated. The site is bounded to the north by a railway line. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is remote from the built form of the settlement, separated by land that has not been promoted for consideration. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Hook-a-Gate than Bayston Hill. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY029 |
| Site Address: | Yewtree Drive south, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.97 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 89 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is a roughly diamond-shaped field currently used for agriculture. The site sits adjacent to the south western side of the Bayston Hill development boundary but outside of it. The site slopes gently upwards from the north to the south. |
| Surrounding Character: | To the north east and north of the site is residential development. The remaining sides of the site are bounded by current agricultural land (sites BAY022, 026, 039 of this study). |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: This site in isolation has no road frontage or potential point of access. However, there are other promoted sites which could provide this site a road frontage (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY030 |
| Site Address: | Land at Redhill Mill, nr. Hookagate. |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.44 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 43 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is formed of a single large dwelling and its curtilage. The curtilage is long and narrow reflecting the sites origination as a railway line. The site falls quite steeply away from Longden Lane to which it has its frontage. The rear of the site is defined by the Rea Brook, the Flood Zones 2&3 of which denote a developable area approx up to about 0.6ha or approx 40% of the site's surface area. The non-Flood Zone area is adjacent to the dwelling at the northern end of the site. |
| Surrounding Character: | Inset into the site to its south along Longden Rd is a further single dwelling and over the Rea Brook is agricultural land. To the opposite side of Longden Lane is an area of pasture land. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is remote from the built form of the settlement, separated by land that has not been promoted for consideration. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Hook-a-Gate than Bayston Hill. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY032 |
| Site Address: | The Burgs, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 6.53 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 196 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | This site occupies a gap between the Sharpstones Lane area of Bayston Hill and the railway line. In character it is a small hill given over to open space or rough pasture with some areas of woodland. A significant proportion of the site is the site of a scheduled monument "The Burgs" iron age hill fort. The portion of the site not designated as a scheduled monument is approx 2.5ha (approx 40% of the site area) to the north east of the site and adjacent to the railway. Power lines cross the site at this point. |
| Surrounding Character: | To its Bayston Hill facing sides (NW, S and W) the site is adjacent to residential development of varying character. To its northern side the site is adjacent to arable land. The entire eastern boundary is formed by a railway to the opposite of which is the Bayston Hill Quarry. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The majority of the site consists of an identified Scheduled Monument (The Burgs). The remainder of the site is in close proximity of this asset. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY033 |
| Site Address: | New House south, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 11.58 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 347 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A large site, slightly undulating in nature, that is utilised for agricultural purposes. The site comprised four fields. To the north west of the site is also included a single dwelling and its curtilage. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is surrounded by agricultural land except at its northern tip where there is a single dwelling outside of the Bayston Hill development boundary. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate size and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). However the site is separated from this land and the built form of the settlement beyond it by the A49. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY035 |
| Site Address: | Community Centre and playing fields, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 5.33 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 160 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | approx 90% |
| General Description: | The site comprises the Lythwood Sports Complex including the tennis courts, BMX park, rec area, club and allotments. The site is flat and is bisected by a lane with the allotments to the south of the lane. The site is adjacent to but outside of the development boundary. |
| Surrounding Character: | To its north east the site is adjacent to residential development and to the north west of the sports complex are the associated sports fields (BAY017 of this study). To the west of the allotments is an area of scrubland . To the north west of the BMX park is an area of woodland. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The majority of the site represents various forms of identified open space, including outdoor sports facilities; allotments and young persons play areas. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY036 |
| Site Address: | Chestnut Drive north, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 8.51 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 255 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | This site is adjacent to the Bayston Hill development boundary but falls outside of it. The site which lies to the north of Bayston Hill is formed of the southern portion of a field, is in agricultural use and slopes down from the south west to the north east. Within the site, to the eastern side, is a large electricity substation. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is bordered by residential development to its southern, SE and SW boundaries. The remainder of the site is bounded by agricultural land |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY037 |
| Site Address: | Pool View north, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.52 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 46 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is situated to the north of Bayston Hill between the A49 and Lower Pulley Lane. The majority of the site is currently used for agricultural purposes and is flat in nature although to the south east of the site is a dwelling with a large (40m diameter) pond within the curtilage. The site falls outside of but adjacent to the development boundary. |
| Surrounding Character: | To the south west of the site is the Three Fishes PH and its car park whilst to the south east is a private residence and its curtilage. The remainder of the surrounding land uses are agricultural in nature. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY038 |
| Site Address: | Moorlands Kennels west and north, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 24.35 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 731 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A very long, narrow site that runs between the A49 and railway line to the south of Bayston Hill. The site has a frontage to the A49 of approx 1.8km and a depth from the road of between (approx) 60m and 330m. The site is mainly flat, although to the south west it does rise from north to south. The site is used for agricultural purposes. The site is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement boundary. |
| Surrounding Character: | The surrounding land is used for agricultural purposes and is separated from any significant development. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). However the site is separated from this land and the built form of the settlement beyond it by the A49. Furthermore the site projects into the open countryside. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY039 |
| Site Address: | Land off Lyth Hill Road, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 6.09 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 183 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A large site to the south of Bayston Hill outside of but adjacent to the development boundary. The site is formed of the entirety of one field and the majority of a second and is currently used for agricultural purposes. The site slopes slightly upwards from north to south. |
| Surrounding Character: | To the north east of the site is a residential area of Bayston Hill. The bulk of the remaining surrounding areas of the site are agricultural in nature although Lythwood House is inset to the site to its south west. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY040 |
| Site Address: | Betley Lane east, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 17.48 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 525 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | This large site sits between western side of the A49 and the built form of Bayston Hill to the southern side of the settlement. The site has a frontage to the A49 of some 800m and a depth ranging between 80-340m (approx). The site is formed of two large fields which are currently used for agriculture and which slope upwards E to W away from the A49 towards the settlement of Bayston Hill. |
| Surrounding Character: | The shorth northern boundary of the site is formed by adjacent housing which continues round to the west of the site for a southerly distance of approx 540m. The remaining border to the west of the site which continues in a southerly direction for approx 280m is bounded by fields. Land to the south and east (on the opposite side of the A49) is in agricultural use. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY041 |
| Site Address: | Hanley Lane north west, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.84 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 25 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A triangular site to the north west of Bayston Hill formed of part of a field that is currently used for agriculture. The site slopes upwards north-south away from Rea Brook. The site is adjacent to the development boundary at its south eastern corner at the junction of Hanley Lane and another PROW |
| Surrounding Character: | At its south eastern tip the site is adjacent to Hanley Lane and its associated residential development. To the south and west of the site is agricultural land. To the other boundary, to the site's north east is an area of woodland. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²:</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³:</p> <p>The site is located within the Green Gap between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill. In isolation, the site is landlocked and does not appear to have a suitable road frontage. Whilst there are other site promotions which could provide an access, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s).</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY042 |
| Site Address: | Fairview Drive west, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.11 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 33 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A site adjacent to the development boundary to the west of Bayston Hill currently used for agricultural purposes. The site appears to be gently undulating. |
| Surrounding Character: | A site to its immediate north has been granted permission and is in the process of development whilst to the site's east is the built form of Bayston Hill. There is an area of woodland to the site's south and open agricultural land to the west. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY043 |
| Site Address: | Gorse Lane end and west, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 4.92 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 148 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A site to the north of Bayston Hill situated on land that slopes quite steeply down to the Rea Brook which forms the site northern boundary. The site is currently used for agricultural purposes. |
| Surrounding Character: | Gorse Lane and its associated residential development terminates at the southern boundary of the site. The remainder of the southern boundary and the western boundary is an area of woodland whilst the northern boundary is formed by Rea Brook beyond which is an area of scrubland prior to the A5, To the east of the site is agricultural land |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY044 |
| Site Address: | Downey Ridge west, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.85 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 86 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is formed by a single field to the northern side of Bayston Hill and is currently used for agriculture. The site falls outside of but adjacent to the Bayston Hill development boundary. The site falls S to N towards Rea Brook. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site falls between site BAY005 of theism study and the rear of the linear development along the northern side of Pulley Lane as it emerges from the settlement. As such to the sites eastern and southern sides is housing whilst to the remainder of the site's sides are agricultural land. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The site is located within the Green Gap between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill. In isolation, the site is landlocked and does not appear to have a road frontage. Whilst there are other site promotions which could provide an access, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY045 |
| Site Address: | Dobbies Garden Centre south, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 7.27 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 218 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | This large site is formed of a single large field and extends the length of the A49 between the Bayston Hill services on the A5 nearly to the start of the Bayston Hill settlement, giving the site a frontage to the A49 of approx 360m. The site is utilised for agricultural purposes and is flat. The site is neither within nor adjacent to the development boundary. |
| Surrounding Character: | To the north of the site is the garden centre and services on the A5/A49 roundabout. The western side is bounded by Lower Pulley lane to the opposite of which is mainly agricultural land but also includes the G2 listed Pulley Hall and its associated G2 listed barns. To the south of the site is a small field which then, in turn, borders onto the built form of Bayston Hill. The east of the site is formed by the A49 on the opposite of which is further agricultural land. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is located within the Green Gap between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill. In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement. Whilst there are other site promotions within this area of separation, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY046 |
| Site Address: | Hanley Lane north west, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.04 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 91 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is closely associated with site BAY043 of this study in that BAY046 skirts round the western and northern edges of BAY043 in an inverted "L" shape . The western element of BAY046 comprises a strip of open space land (approx 400m long N-S with depth E-W varying between approx 20-100m) which is mainly wooded but with some scrubland to its northern end. The northern element of BAY046 is defined by the line of a PROW that defines the northern extent of BAY043 and the Rea Brook. There is a marked downward slope S to N to the site. The site lies to the north of Bayston Hill and is outside the development boundary to which the south eastern side of the site is adjacent. |
| Surrounding Character: | To either side of the site is agricultural land whilst to the north is Rea Brook and an area of associated scrubland. To the south and south east of the site are dwellings associated with Gorse Lane |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is located within the Green Gap between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill. The majority of the site is heavily wooded. The southern element of the site most closely associated with the built form of the settlement is covered by a group TPO. The northern branch of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY047 |
| Site Address: | The Former Railway Engineering Works |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.99 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 90 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site lies between Longden Road and the railway line. It is formed of a long thin triangular piece of land amounting to 7ha that was once occupied by railway sidings and welding sheds which became disused in 1960 and were dismantled. The ground has now returned to a natural state and is now in appearance an area of scrubland between woodland areas. The site is therefore not categorised as brownfield. The site is elevated above neighbouring residential area at Redhill. The site is located 500m to the north of Hook-a-Gate , 500m to the north west of Bayston Hill and 1km to the south west of Shrewsbury to the south of the A5 and a railway line. |
| Surrounding Character: | The surrounding area is predominantly agricultural although to the south east of the site are a small number of dwellings on Redhill Drive above which the site is elevated. The site is bounded to the north by a railway line. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is remote from the built form of the settlement, separated by land that has not been promoted for consideration. The site is more closely associated with the built form of Hook-a-Gate than Bayston Hill. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY048 |
| Site Address: | White House, Lyth Hill Road, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.13 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 94 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site includes dwelling known as the White House and associated buildings as well as several fields east of this in agricultural use. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is in a rural location, surrounded by land in agricultural use but its north-western corner is very close to the Bayston Hill development boundary. A small complex of buildings on the site's northern boundary are used as stables. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY048VAR |
| Site Address: | White House, Lyth Hill Road, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.64 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 19 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site consists of the two thirds of an agricultural field located to the south east of Bayston Hill. Site boundaries are defined by the road to the west, agricultural field boundaries to the north and east a property curtilage for part of the southern boundary and is undefined for the remainder. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is in a rural location, surrounded by land in agricultural use but its north-western corner is very close to the Bayston Hill development boundary. A large property (White House) and associated buildings is located to the south of the site. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | N/A |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY049 |
| Site Address: | Primrose Cottage, Lyth Hill Road, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.25 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 7 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site includes the residential property of Primrose Cottage, associated outbuildings and surrounding gardens. |
| Surrounding Character: | Essentially rural in nature. Apart from Lyth Hill Pre-school and Nursery to the south, the remaining land is in agricultural use. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement. Whilst there are other site promotions within this area of separation, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY050 |
| Site Address: | Former Oaklands School, Bayston Hill |
| Settlement: | Bayston Hill |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.10 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 93 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | Approximately 25% |
| General Description: | The site consists of the former Oaklands School and adjacent Glebe Land. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly residential. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | N/A |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Community Hub: Bicton

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT001 |
| Site Address: | Poultry Houses, Woodlands, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.08 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 62 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site comprises four poultry houses. |
| Surrounding Character: | Land to the south, west and north is in agricultural use, whilst a farm complex lies to the southeast. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT002 |
| Site Address: | South of Holyhead Road, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.36 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 41 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site to south of Holyhead Rd adjacent to but outside the development boundary of Community Cluster of Bicton/Four Crosses. Site currently in use for storage and recycling of construction materials but no buildings on site. Site is contained within otherwise agricultural surroundings and has boundary and road frontage/vehicle access from Holyhead Rd. Site boundaries are clearly defined by trees and hedgerows all round. Flat site with gradual upward slope from E-W. Pedestrian and cycle access via Holyhead Rd (pavement) to existing network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural, countryside, residential development to NE (Bicton village) |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT006 |
| Site Address: | Land to north of Holyhead Road and west of the primary School, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.47 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 44 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site adjoins residential properties and primary school and playing fields to E; to W and N is further agricultural land; to S is Holyhead Rd and another residential property. Site has clearly defined boundaries comprised of trees and hedgerows. Site has road frontage and vehicle access to Holyhead Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access via Holyhead Rd (pavement) to existing network. Site is covered by area based TPO. Small watercourse along E boundary of site may have wildlife/ecology implications. Flat site |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural to N, S, and W, built development to E. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT009 |
| Site Address: | School House, Holyhead Road, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.76 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 23 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | 20% |
| General Description: | Mixed site within development boundary of settlement currently in use as education centre for young people in care using former village school building, Site includes former village school and associated playground now used for parking etc as well as adjacent portion of open space and village recreation ground including MUGA. Site has clearly defined boundaries with adjoining properties. Boundaries comprised mix of wire fencing (to highway), trees and hedgerows and stone walling. Site contains number of mature trees. Site has extensive road frontage to Holyhead Rd and vehicle access from Holyhead Rd into education centre. Site has pedestrian and cycle access onto Holyhead Rd. Site has residential estate development to E; to W and S are individual residential properties; to N is further recreation and open space and village hall. |
| Surrounding Character: | Mixed but primarily residential and built development. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The majority of the site is an identified open space. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT010 |
| Site Address: | Villa Farm, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.76 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 23 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | |
| General Description: | Brownfield site within development boundary of Bicton. Currently contains converted barns and single residential property and associated gardens and parking. Site is access via rough unsurfaced track from Holyhead Rd though no road frontage. Pedestrian and cycle access via track to Holyhead Rd and existing links. Site is bounded by residential development to S and W and to N and E by agricultural land. Boundaries appear to be clearly defined by trees and hedgerows. Flat site. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential to W and S - agricultural to E and N. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT011X |
| Site Address: | Land off Bicton Lane |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.15 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT013 |
| Site Address: | Land South of Bicton Hall, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.52 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 76 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside and away from Bicton development boundary. Site currently in agricultural use for grazing/fodder crops. Site contains number of mature trees and has area TPOs on parts of site. Currently bisected by surfaced private driveway access to properties at Bicton Hall. Also contains barn and farm buildings - subject to dismissed prior approval app - in N portion. Site has parkland appearance and adjoins to N the former walled garden of Bicton Hall. To N site is bounded by BIT012 former walled garden (now has pp for 2 dwells) and residential properties at Bicton Hall; to W, S and E surroundings are predominantly agricultural. Boundaries are mostly trees and hedgerows. Site has extensive road frontage to Bicton Lane and existing vehicle access in form of private driveway. Pedestrian and cycle access via Bicton Lane to existing established network |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural in appearance with cluster of residential properties to NW |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT014 |
| Site Address: | Land at The Smithy, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.36 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 71 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside and removed from development boundary of Bicton but adjacent to development boundary for Four Crosses, however site lies between residential properties on Holyhead Rd and garage/car sales/shop and Four Crosses Pub on junction with Isle Lane. Site currently in agricultural use for fodder/arable crops. Site is bounded by residential properties to W and garage/business to E; by agricultural land to N and S. Site boundaries are clearly defined by hedges to S,E and W but no discernible boundary to N. Site has extensive road frontage and existing vehicle access to Holyhead Rd, Pedestrian and cycle access via Holyhead Rd to existing established links. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural in appearance with built development at E and W boundaries of site. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT015 |
| Site Address: | Land at Bicton Farm, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.49 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 15 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | 80% |
| General Description: | Brownfield site outside development boundary for Bicton. Site currently contains 2x barn in agricultural use and private residential property and associated hard standing/storage areas. Site is bounded by residential properties to N and SE and agricultural land elsewhere. Site boundaries clearly discernible to N with residential properties; to S by access track; to W by Bicton Lane but not to W - boundary appears arbitrary. Site has frontage and existing highway access to Bicton Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via Bicton Lane to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Generally agricultural in appearance apart from residential properties to N. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT018X |
| Site Address: | Land south of Brethren's meeting room |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.18 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.2ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: The site is more closely associated with the built form of Four Crosses than Bicton.</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT019X |
| Site Address: | Land east of Merton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.15 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT020 |
| Site Address: | Land adj. Brockway, Four Crosses |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.24 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 7 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site within development boundary of Four Crosses on SW corner of junction of Holyhead Rd, Shepherds Lane and Isle Lane. Site is bounded by Brethren meeting room to W; residential properties S, Pub to N and agricultural land to E.. Boundaries are clearly defined with roads and neighbouring properties. Site has road frontage to Shepherds lane and Holyhead Rd with existing access from Shepherds Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via Shepherds Lane to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Mostly developed to N, W, and S with agriculture to W. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT021 |
| Site Address: | Site adjoining Bicton School, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.85 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 26 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site to N of primary school outside but adjacent to development boundary currently in agricultural use for grazing. Site is bounded by primary school to S; Bicton Lane and residential estate development to E; residential properties and agricultural land to N and further agricultural land to W. Boundaries comprised mostly of trees and hedges with some fencing on N boundary. Watercourse runs along N and W boundary. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to Bicton Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via Bicton Lane to existing established links. |
| Surrounding Character: | Edge of settlement site so mix of development and farmland/countryside. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT022 |
| Site Address: | East of Villa Farm, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 6.21 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 186 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary to E of Bicton. Site comprises 3 distinct field units - 2 smaller parcels adjoining Holyhead Rd further larger parcel to N all currently in agricultural use for grazing/arable/fodder crops. Site is bounded by mixture of residential estate development and individual properties to W; to E is further agricultural land and residential properties in SE corner; to N is further agricultural land; to S is Holyhead Rd and further agricultural land. Internal and external boundaries appear to be mostly comprised trees and hedgerows with some fencing. Site has extensive road frontage to Holyhead Rd but no current access; current vehicle access appears to be down Bicton Villa unsurfaced access track on W edge of site. Pedestrian and cycle access via track to Holyhead Rd and existing established links. |
| Surrounding Character: | Edge of settlement site so mix of development and farmland/countryside. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT023 |
| Site Address: | Land east of Bicton Lane, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.37 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 71 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Residential development to east and north-west; church field to south and agricultural to north. site forms part of an open area of gently undulating fields and is currently agricultural grazing land. The eastern edge abuts the properties of Brookside, a relatively modern Close of residential properties. To the west is Bicton Lane, which in the section nearest to the appeal site, comprises a narrow single carriageway with a strongly rural appearance, bounded by mature trees and hedgerows. At some distance to the south, beyond the boundary of the appeal site, is Holy Trinity Parish Church, an attractive Grade II church built between 1885-7. There are other designated and non-designated heritage assets in the locality. Immediately to the north and beyond is attractive rural countryside. Small road frontages to Bicton Lane and Brookside current highway access via Bicton Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via Bicton Lane to existing established networks. Site has been subject to 2 refused applications subsequently dismissed at appeal as contrary to policy and impact on landscape character and environmental dimensions of sustainability. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, with the exception of residential development to the south-east and some large dwellings and their curtilages to the north-west. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT024 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Bicton Farm, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.94 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 28 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site in open countryside to west of cluster of dwellings and farm buildings as old part of Bicton. Site is currently in agricultural use for rough grazing/fodder crops. Site has agricultural land on N, S and E and boundary with Bicton Lane and residential properties and farm buildings to W. Boundaries to W and S are clearly defined by Bicton Lane and access track however N and E boundaries are not discernible and appear arbitrary. Site has road frontage and access to Bicton Lane though this has deteriorated to very narrow lane with few residential properties beyond this point. Pedestrian and cycle access via Bicton lane to existing established links |
| Surrounding Character: | Farmland in appearance with individual properties and farm complex to W. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT025 |
| Site Address: | Land west of Bicton Lane, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.00 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 30 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site in open countryside to west of cluster of dwellings and farm buildings as old part of Bicton. Site is currently in agricultural use for rough grazing/fodder crops. Site has agricultural land on N, S and E and boundary with Bicton Lane and residential properties and farm buildings to W. Boundaries to W and N are clearly defined by Bicton Lane and access track however S and E boundaries are not discernible and appear arbitrary. Site has road frontage and access to Bicton Lane though this has deteriorated to very narrow lane with few residential properties beyond this point. Pedestrian and cycle access via Bicton lane to existing established links |
| Surrounding Character: | Farmland in appearance with individual properties and farm complex to W. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT026 |
| Site Address: | Land East of Calcott Lane, south-east of Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 15.24 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 457 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary of Four Crosses element of cluster. Site is currently in agricultural use for grazing/fodder crops. Site has agricultural land N, S, and W; to E is residential development and Brethren Meeting House. Site has extensive road frontage to both Holyhead Rd and Calcott Lane. Site has current vehicle access from Calcott Lane. Site boundaries are a mix of established hedgerows and trees with some additional fencing along Holyhead Rd. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural with built development to W |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT027 |
| Site Address: | Land west of Isle Lane, east of Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 5.94 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 178 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large greenfield site in open countryside away from development boundaries. Site is currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Largely surrounded by other agricultural uses with some scattered residential properties and farm buildings to SW corner and Bicton Business Park to W. Site boundaries clearly defined and comprised of hedgerows and mature trees on all sides. Road frontage and current vehicle access to Isle Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via Isle La (no pavement) to existing established network. Site is crossed by low voltage overhead power lines. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural with commercial uses at Business Park to W. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is remote from the built form of the settlement, separated by land that has not been promoted for consideration. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT028 |
| Site Address: | East of Isle Lane, east of Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.62 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 19 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | 10% |
| General Description: | Mixed site away from development boundaries currently in agricultural use for rough grazing with 2 residential properties on site in NW corner of site. Boundaries are not clearly discernible on N and E boundaries - arbitrary line across fields; to W boundary with Isle Lane and residential properties, to S boundary of trees and hedgerow with other agricultural land. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access from Isle Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via Isle La (no pavement) to existing established network. Site adjoins existing residential properties to SW and N but is surrounded by agricultural land in all other directions. |
| Surrounding Character: | Mostly agricultural with some residential in immediate proximity. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²:</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: The site is remote from the built form of the settlement, separated by land that has not been promoted for consideration.</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT029 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Bicton Business Park, east of Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.25 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 38 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site to rear of existing Bicton Business Park, Site is outside and away from development boundaries. Currently in agricultural use for grazing. Site adjoins existing business park to W and garden of Rossall Heath House to S; further agricultural land to W and N. Boundaries clearly defined by adjoining uses and access track to N however E boundary is not defined - arbitrary line across field. Site has no road frontage as such but is access by surfaced road from Isle Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via Isle La (no pavement) to existing established network. Large pond to S of site in garden of Rossall Heath House. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural and commercial. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is remote from the built form of the settlement, separated by land that has not been promoted for consideration. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT030 |
| Site Address: | Land at Bicton Hall, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.90 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 57 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is in agricultural use and contains a large square enclosure which may be a former walled garden associated with Bicton Hall. |
| Surrounding Character: | A mix of agricultural and sporadic residential. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT031 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Oxon Pool, Four Crosses |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.92 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 88 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is in agricultural use (grazing). |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential to the west, touring caravan park to south-east, agriculture otherwise. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is more closely associated with the built form of Four Crosses than Bicton. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT032 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Bitcon House, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.23 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 67 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site consists of parts of a series of irregularly shaped fields to the south-west of Bicton. Site boundaries are defined by the extent of a wooded area (within the promotion) to the west; the same wooded area and a property curtilage defines parts of the southern boundary, although this is also part undefined to the south; and a hedgerow field boundary to the north. |
| Surrounding Character: | Predominantly agricultural land. There are some rural buildings in proximity and land to the north is used for storage/recycling. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | N/A |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT033 |
| Site Address: | Land off Holyhead Road, Bicton |
| Settlement: | Bicton |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.07 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A very small triangular site. Site boundaries are defined by an access track to the north-west, a field boundary to the east and are undefined to the south. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural and residential. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | N/A |
| Availability Information ¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA.</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Community Hub: Bomere Heath

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM002 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south of Preston Grubbals Road, Bomere Heath |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 3.33 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 100 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site is a large agricultural field. The site slopes slightly, its boundaries are formed mostly by hedgerows and residential curtilages. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential dwellings can be seen immediately west of the site as part of the village of Bomere Heath. The south and east sides are agricultural, and the north of the site runs parallel to Preston Grubbals Road |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM003 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Preston Grubbals Road, Bomere Heath |
| Settlement: | Bomere Heath |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.50 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 45 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is a large agricultural field. The site slopes slightly, its boundaries are formed mostly by hedgerows and residential curtilages. It is positioned north of Preston Grubbals Road, east of Bomere Heath. The site is relatively flat. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is situated east of Bomere Heath, with its southern boundary running parallel to Preston Grubbals Road. There is a Reservoir to the north of the site. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM004 |
| Site Address: | Land west of Merrington Road, Bomere Heath |
| Settlement: | Bomere Heath |
| Site Size (Ha): | 9.99 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 300 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | This site consists of a series of agricultural fields, to the north west of Bomere Heath adjacent to Merrington Road, and is situated behind Pump Road and Percy Thrower Avenue, north of Baschurch Road. The site is slightly sloped with its highest point to the west side. The site is outside of the Bomere Heath development boundary. |
| Surrounding Character: | Site is surrounded by agricultural land to the north and east, with the existing built form (residential) to the west and south. Bomere Heath Methodist Church located just south of the site. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM006 |
| Site Address: | Land north-east of the railway line, west of Bomere Heath |
| Settlement: | Bomere Heath |
| Site Size (Ha): | 4.89 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 147 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is inaccessible to both pedestrians and vehicles. Its south west boundary runs along the trainline. The north boundary runs along a hedgerow, with a large pylon in the north-west corner of the site. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is situated south west of Bomere Heath, running adjacent to the trainlines north of the level crossing at The Old Station B&B, and north of the cricket and football pitches. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM007X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Brook Road |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.11 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Mixed |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | |
| <i>General Description:</i> | |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.2ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM008 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | North of Cornfield Close, Bomere Heath |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.20 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 6 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site is located to the north east corner of Bomere Heath village, along Cornfield Close. It is designated as Open Space. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Housing surrounds the site to the west, south and east, with agricultural land to the north behind a hedgerow |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is an identified amenity open space. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM010 |
| Site Address: | Land north of the Pavilion, south-west of Bomere Heath |
| Settlement: | Bomere Heath |
| Site Size (Ha): | 6.75 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 203 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site comprises two rectangular fields to the south west of the settlement. The northern field is in agricultural use (cropping) whilst the southern one is a football field. Overhead electricity lines cross the centre of the site from north-west to south-east |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural land to the west, north and east, cricket ground to the south. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | A portion of the site is identified as an outdoor sports facility. In isolation, the sites only road frontage/point of access is via the element of the site that is an identified outdoor sports facility. However, there are other promoted sites which could provide this site a road frontage (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM012 |
| Site Address: | Land at Broomhall Lane, Bomere Heath |
| Settlement: | Bomere Heath |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.91 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 27 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is greenfield behind the curtilage of the residential dwellings to the east side of Bomere Heath, outside of the development boundary. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential dwellings comprise the west side of the site, with agricultural land to the east. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | This site in isolation has no road frontage or potential point of access. However, there are other promoted sites which could provide this site a road frontage (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM013 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land north of Baschurch Road, Bomere Heath |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.35 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 71 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site is a large agricultural field. The site is fairly flat throughout, its boundaries are formed by hedgerows and Baschurch Road |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | The site is surrounded by agricultural land, with some residential use to the south east. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM014 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land to the rear of The Crescent, Bomere Heath |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.22 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 36 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site is west of Bomere Heath, outside of the development boundary behind the curtilage of the residential dwellings on The Crescent. There is no clear access to the site. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Site is surrounded by residential to the east and agricultural land to the west. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is landlocked and does not appear to have a road frontage. Whilst there are other site promotions which could provide an access, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM015 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land west of The Orchard, Bomere Heath |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.66 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 20 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site is located adjacent to the development boundary of Bomere Heath, at the end of Whitehouse Lane. This is however after a private road and so is not currently accessible. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | To the east of the site are residential dwellings, with agricultural land to the north, south and west sides. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is landlocked and does not appear to have a road frontage. Whilst there are other site promotions which could provide an access, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM016 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south of Magnolia Close, Bomere Heath |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 4.15 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 124 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site runs along Shrewsbury Road just south of Magnolia Close. The site is adjacent to a dwelling and its curtilage, and the remainder of the site is agricultural land. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | The site is surrounded on three sides by agricultural land, with Shrewsbury Road immediately to the west. South west of the site are cricket and football pitches, and Bomere Heath itself is immediately north. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM017 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land east and west of Broomhall Lane |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.88 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 56 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site is located either side of Broomhall Lane, to the east of Bomere Heath. It is currently primarily used for agricultural purposes but also includes the telephone exchange building and its curtilage. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding the site is residential to the west and agricultural east, north and south. Broomhall lane which splits the site is narrow and enters Bomere Heath northwards. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM019 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | West of Chelmaren, Bomere Heath |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.98 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 59 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site to the south of settlement in agricultural use (part arable and part grazing). |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Isolated dwelling (Chelmaren) to the east, agricultural uses to south, west and north. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Conclusion: Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM020 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | North of football pitch, Bomere Heath |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.90 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 27 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site in agricultural use (cropping) and lies to the south west of the settlement. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Land to the west, north and east is in agricultural use whilst a football pitch and cricket ground lie to the south. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM021 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | East of Merrington Road, Bomere Heath |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.76 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 23 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site is in agricultural use (cropping) and lies to the north of Bomere Heath, off Merrington Road. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Land partly adjacent to north and south west has been developed for affordable housing whilst land to the south comprises older residential development. Other surrounding land is in agricultural use. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM022 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | North of Preston Grubbals Road, Bomere Heath |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.56 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 47 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site is in agricultural use (grazing) and lies to the east of Bomere Heath along the Preston Grubbals road |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Land to the west and south is in residential use, land to the north and east is in agricultural use. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Conclusion: Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM023 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Grange Farm, Bomere Heath |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 5.95 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 178 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site is in agricultural use (cropping) and lies to the north east of Bomere Heath. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agricultural land to east, north and part of west of site. Residential to the south-west and south. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Conclusion: Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM024 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land to the north of Bomere Heath |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Bomere Heath |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 6.50 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 195 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site is a large agricultural field. The site slopes downwards slightly towards the west side, its boundaries are formed by hedgerows and residential curtilages. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential dwellings can be seen to the south of the site as part of the village of Bomere Heath. The north and east sides are agricultural. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Community Hub: Cross Houses

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | CSH001 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land to the rear of Russel Place, Cross Houses |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Cross Houses |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.82 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 54 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site comprises a series of linear back gardens to the south-west of the Russel Place houses. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Land to the east is semi-natural scrubland, the remainder of the surrounding land is in agricultural use. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | CSH003 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Wrekin View, Cross Houses |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Cross Houses |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.42 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 73 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site is in agricultural use (cropping) and lies to the east of Cross Houses and south of the A458 as it leaves the village. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Agriculture except for the northern tip of the site which adjoins a two recently constructed houses. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | CSH004 |
| Site Address: | Berrington Station, Cross Houses |
| Settlement: | Cross Houses |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.82 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 55 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | 40% |
| General Description: | Site comprises former railway station (Berrington) and is linear in nature. Part of site is occupied by a fitness training business and All Saints Church, Berrington. The remainder of the site is maintained grassland with hedges and trees. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agriculture to the west and south, residential to the north and open scrub land to the east. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | CSH005 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land west of Cross Houses |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Cross Houses |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.84 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 85 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site is linear and parallel to the A458 as it enters Cross Houses. It is in agricultural use (cropping). |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Land to the south comprised houses of Russel Place, whilst remainder of surrounding land is in agricultural use. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | CSH006 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south of the Bell Inn, Cross Houses |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Cross Houses |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 4.24 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 127 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of a large agricultural field located to the south of Cross Houses and the west of a development site. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to south and east is primarily agricultural. Character to north is primarily residential. Character to the west is a mix of residential and a site currently being developed for residential. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Community Hub: Dorrington

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN001x |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Lower Fold |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Dorrington |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.15 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Greenfield site containing woodland/scrubland. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential and agricultural. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information*:</i> | |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN002 |
| Site Address: | Land adj. Station Road, Dorrington |
| Settlement: | Dorrington |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.65 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 110 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is located to the E of Dorrington, outside of the development boundary and across from the bridge from Dorrington along Station Road. The site is fairly large given the current built form of Dorrington, and is used for agricultural purposes. Much of the site (around two-thirds) lies within flood zone 2/3 to the site's east and south boundaries. The railway line runs along the site's western boundary (however this is on a lower part of land). |
| Surrounding Character: | A light industrial site lies to the N of the site, across from Station Road. The E and S of the site comprises of further agricultural land, with the built form of Dorrington lying to the W beyond the railway lines. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information*: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN003 |
| Site Address: | Land adj. The Maitlands, Dorrington |
| Settlement: | Dorrington |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.51 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 45 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is located to the W of Dorrington, outside of the development boundary. Access to the site can be found at its eastern border, from The Maitlands. Currently for agricultural use, the site runs adjacent to part of Dorrington's built form to its NE. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is surrounded by further agricultural land to its N, S and W. To the east lies the existing built form of Dorrington, which mostly comprises of houses, as well as a surgery and a football pitch. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information*: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN004 |
| Site Address: | Land North of Dorrington |
| Settlement: | Dorrington |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.14 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 34 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is located to the NW of Dorrington, outside of the development boundary. Site is currently agricultural use, and lies immediately N of the existing residential curtilage of the village. Whilst the site is not currently accessible, there are schemes in the adjacent site (to the E) which includes an access road which runs to this site. There are no other ways to access this site and so its suitability is dependent on the adjacent development. |
| Surrounding Character: | Site is mostly surrounded by agricultural land, except to the S and SE where residential dwellings reside. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information*: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN006X |
| Site Address: | Hall on Forge Way |
| Settlement: | Dorrington |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.16 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | Approx. 50% |
| General Description: | Site containing part of an agricultural field and an existing hall. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential, commercial and agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information*: | |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN007 |
| Site Address: | Playground, The Maitlands, Dorrington |
| Settlement: | Dorrington |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.27 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 68 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is located in the centre of Dorrington, within the development boundary. Within the site lies Dorrington Surgery and Dorrington Business Network to the W, near the site's main access off The Maitlands. Beside this lies a car park, and much of the centre of E of the site comprises of Outdoor Recreation (a sports pitch and a bowling green), with an open field just S of this (and N of the primary school). An additional, minor access can be found off Church Road to the S, via a narrow single carriage strip adjacent to the primary school. The site is currently under ownership of Shropshire Council. A children's play area also sits in the centre of the site beside the sports pitch. |
| Surrounding Character: | Site is largely surrounded by the existing built form of Dorrington, which is mostly residential dwellings. In addition, St Edward's C of E Primary School lies to the S of the site as well as St Edward's Church. Agricultural land lies to the W of the site beyond The Maitlands |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information*: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The majority of the site consists of an identified outdoor sports facility and children's playground. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN008X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | 24 The Bank |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Dorrington |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.02 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Grassed area within the built form of Dorington. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Residential. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information*:</i> | |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN013X |
| Site Address: | R. O. Post, Church Road, Dorrington |
| Settlement: | Dorrington |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.08 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | 100% |
| General Description: | Brownfield site. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information*: | |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN014 |
| Site Address: | Land adj. Butler Fuels, Dorrington |
| Settlement: | Dorrington |
| Site Size (Ha): | 4.13 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 124 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is located NE of the village, outside of the development boundary and across from the railways lines. The site lies against Cound Brook to its eastern boundary, which causes much of the site to be in flood zone 2/3. The only road frontage is to the S off Station Rd. |
| Surrounding Character: | Site is surrounded on its N and E sides by further agricultural land. Beyond the railway lines to the W lies further agricultural land, and likewise beyond Station Road to the south is agricultural land. Some light industrial is immediately adjacent to the site at its SW corner, with a single dwelling to the E. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information*: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The site is remote from the built form of the settlement, separated by land that has not been promoted for consideration. Much of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN015 |
| Site Address: | Church Bridge Field, Dorrington |
| Settlement: | Dorrington |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.05 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 61 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site lies to the east side of Dorrington, adjacent to but outside of the development boundary. Sites currently has agricultural use and lies just off Bank Drive, adjacent to existing residential curtilage. The SE of the site is in flood zone 2/3, which covers around 20% of the overall site area. |
| Surrounding Character: | Cound Brook lies to the east of the site, leaving the site's SE corner in flood zone 2/3. The site is otherwise surrounded by residential, with further agricultural land beyond Cound Brook to the E. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information*: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN016 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land to the South of Church Road, Dorrington |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Dorrington |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.38 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 11 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site is on the W side of Dorrington, outside of the development boundary. The site lies behind an existing dwelling, off Church Road to the N. The site cannot currently be accessed. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | The site is surrounded by hedgerows to the E, W and S, with residential immediately to the N. Some farm buildings are nearby to the S and W |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information*:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Conclusion: Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN017 |
| Site Address: | Land south of The Fars, off Faulklands Road, Dorrington |
| Settlement: | Dorrington |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.47 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 44 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | 20% |
| General Description: | Site is located to the S of Dorrington outside of the development boundary. Site is N of the Cound Brook, and lies immediately E of the A49 (Main Road). There is an existing agricultural building on the side, and the site as a whole comprises of half of the existing field |
| Surrounding Character: | The A49 lies to the W of the site, with agricultural fields to the E, S and W. Residential curtilage is to the N. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information*: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN018 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | The Limes Paddock, Dorrington |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Dorrington |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.64 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 19 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of part of an agricultural field, the remainder of which has been granted Planning Permission for residential development. The site is located to the north of Dorrington. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to north and east is predominantly agricultural. Character to south is primarily residential. Character to the west is currently a mix of agricultural and ongoing residential development. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information*:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Conclusion: Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN019 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south-west of Forge Way, Dorrington |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Dorrington |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.24 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 7 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of part of the northern part of an agricultural field located to the south of Dorrington. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to south and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north is agricultural (land allocated for residential development). Character to the east is a mix of residential and commercial. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information*:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN020 |
| Site Address: | Land west of Dorrington House, Dorrington |
| Settlement: | Dorrington |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.25 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 7 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of part of the southern part of an agricultural field located to the south of Dorrington. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to south and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north is agricultural (Planning Application pending decision for residential development). Character to the east is a mix of residential and commercial. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information*: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| | This site in isolation has no road frontage or potential point of access. However, there are other promoted sites which could provide this site a road frontage (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | DGN021 |
| Site Address: | Land off Station Road, Dorrington |
| Settlement: | Dorrington |
| Site Size (Ha): | 4.29 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 129 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of the southern component of a large agricultural field located to the north-east of Dorrington. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north is predominantly agricultural. Character to the west is predominantly residential. Character to the south is residential beyond which it is agricultural. Character to the east is commercial (beyond the railway line). |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information*: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Community Hub: Ford

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD001 |
| Site Address: | The Leasowes Recreation Ground, Ford |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.19 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 36 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site to W of built form of village. Long standing use for formal and informal outdoor recreation includes football pitch, MUGA and children's play area. Site in SC freehold former SABC land, not promoted. Site has residential use to N and E and further agricultural land to W and S. Small stream/watercourse along W boundary of site. Boundaries to E,N, and S comprised established trees and hedgerows to W boundary with residential properties. Site does not have road frontage and vehicle access for maintenance etc via single lane access track off The Leasowes. Pedestrian and cycle links via access track or footpath at S end of site also to Leasowes |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural and residential. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site consists of an identified outdoor sports facility and identified children's/young persons play spaces. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD002X |
| Site Address: | The Squirrels, Shoothill, Ford |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.12 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 4 |
| Type of Site: | Not Known |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹ : | |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD003X |
| Site Address: | Land adj. Clifton Cottage, Ford |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.11 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 3 |
| Type of Site: | Not Known |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹ : | |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD004 |
| Site Address: | Land to the rear of Inglenook and New House, Ford |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.22 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 6 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site on N edge of built up area of village. Site currently in agricultural use for rough grazing. Site has individual residential properties to E and further agricultural land on other 3 sides. Site has defined boundaries to N E and S comprised hedges and fences with some established trees to S. W boundary not defined on ground. Site does not have road frontage and current vehicle access via track between New House and Honeysuckle properties to New Street. Pedestrian and cycle links via same access to New Street and then established network o pavement on New St. Large pond adjacent to S boundary. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural, open 'parkland' countryside and individual properties. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD005 |
| Site Address: | Land at Lower Farm, Ford |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.76 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 23 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site in agricultural use comprised entirely agricultural buildings (barns, storage units, livestock sheds etc). Located on N edge of built form of village. Site has residential properties to S and W and further agricultural land to N and E. Site boundaries for the most part clearly defined on ground by hedgerows/trees and fencing, part of N boundary not clearly defined on ground. Site has road frontage and existing vehicle access to New St. Pedestrian and cycle links via same access to New Street and then established network of pavement on New St. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the south and west is residential (large rural dwellings on large plots). Character to the east and north is agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD006X |
| Site Address: | Land South of Manor Crest |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.19 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 6 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.2ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD007 |
| Site Address: | Land at Alberbury Road, Ford |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 14.70 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 441 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large greenfield site away from built form of Ford village to W and physically separated by line of dismantled railway. Site is surrounded by land in agricultural use with the exception of plant hire business on S boundary, pub/restaurant on W boundary and individual properties on W boundary. Site has no physical attachment to built form of village. Site boundaries are clearly defined by trees and disused rail line to N; by access track to W; by hedgerows and Alberbury road to S and pub and lane to E. Site has extensive road frontage and current vehicle access to Alberbury Rd and Brook lane, Pedestrian and cycle links via same access points to established network - no pavement provision |
| Surrounding Character: | Open countryside in agricultural use with scattered individual properties and businesses |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD009 |
| Site Address: | Land adj. Pen y Bryn, Ford |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.39 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 42 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site on W edge of built form of village. Site has individual residential properties to W and N and further agricultural land to S and E. Site boundaries are clearly defined on the ground by hedgerows and trees on all four sides. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to access road to poultry farm. Pedestrian and cycle access via same route to established network - no pavement provision. Application on N portion of site for 2 dwellings refused on appeal March 2016 as contrary to policy and for harm to countryside and setting of conservation area. |
| Surrounding Character: | Open countryside in agricultural use with scattered properties and businesses. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD011 |
| Site Address: | Land east of But Lane and north of A458, Ford |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 4.05 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 122 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of an agricultural field located to the south east of Ford. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the south and east is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north and west is predominantly residential and areas of open space. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD012 |
| Site Address: | Land adjacent to Portwat Cottages, south of the A458, Ford |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 4.08 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 122 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of an agricultural field located to the south of Ford. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, however there are also rural dwellings. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD013 |
| Site Address: | Land at Bank Farm, Ford |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 10.36 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 311 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | the site consists of a large agricultural field located to the west of Ford. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to south and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north and east is a mix of residential, agricultural and open space. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| Availability Information¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD014 |
| Site Address: | Land at Brookfield, Welshpool Road, Ford |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.83 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 25 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | Approx. 5% |
| General Description: | The site consists of pony paddocks and the property known as Brookfield, located to the south of Ford. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to south and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is currently agricultural, however the adjacent field has Planning Permission for residential development. Character to the north is a mix of residential, agricultural and open space. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD015X |
| Site Address: | Land at the Bungalow, Alberbury Road, West of Ford |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.12 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 4 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | <p>Availability¹:</p> <p>Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p>Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA</p> |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD016 |
| Site Address: | Severnford Gardens, Ford |
| Settlement: | Ford |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.50 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 15 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | Approx. 50% |
| General Description: | The site consists of a dwelling, associated buildings and their curtilage. The site is located to the north of Ford. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north, east and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the south is a mix of agricultural and residential. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| Availability Information¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Community Hub: Hanwood

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | HWD001X |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Vine Close |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Hanwood |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.10 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | <5 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Not Known |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.2ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | HWD002 |
| Site Address: | Land off Orchard Lane, Hanwood |
| Settlement: | Hanwood |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.21 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 66 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of the remaining elements of an agricultural field following the development of a dwelling to the north. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north is a mix of residential, open space and woodland. Character to the south and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is predominantly residential. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | HWD003 |
| Site Address: | Land West of Romney House, Pound Lane, west of Hanwood |
| Settlement: | Hanwood |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.52 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 16 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of scrubland to the rear of dwellings on Pound Lane. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to north, west and south is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is residential beyond which it is woodland. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is remote from the built form of the settlement, separated by land that has not been promoted for consideration. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | HWD004 |
| Site Address: | East of Cruckmeole Farm, Hanwood |
| Settlement: | Hanwood |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.68 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 50 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of part of an agricultural field located to the west of Hanwood. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is currently agricultural, however this land has been allocated for residential development. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | HWD005 |
| Site Address: | Land at the Hawthorns, Hanwood |
| Settlement: | Hanwood |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.90 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 57 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The sit consists of agricultural land and a wooded area. The site is located to the south of Hanwood. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to south and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to north is predominantly residential character to the east is a mix of residential and agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | HWB001X |
| Site Address: | The Oaklands, Hanwood |
| Settlement: | Hanwood Bank |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.11 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| | Strategic Suitability³: As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | HWB003 |
| Site Address: | Land at The Oaklands, Hanwood Bank |
| Settlement: | Hanwood Bank |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.74 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 52 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of an agricultural field located to the west of Hanwood Bank. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north, west and south is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is predominantly residential. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The site is more closely associated with the built form of Hanwood Bank than Hanwood. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | HWB004 |
| Site Address: | Land at Hanwood Bank |
| Settlement: | Hanwood Bank |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.67 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 110 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of part of an agricultural field. This site is located to the north and east of Hanwood Bank. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the south is residential, beyond which it is agricultural. Character to the north, east and west is agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: The site is more closely associated with the built form of Hanwood Bank than Hanwood. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | HWB006 |
| Site Address: | Land west of Caradoc View, Hanwood Bank |
| Settlement: | Hanwood Bank |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.52 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 46 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of part of an agricultural field located to the west of Hanwood Bank. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north and south is agricultural, beyond which it is residential. Character to the east is predominantly residential. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is more closely associated with the built form of Hanwood Bank than Hanwood. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Community Hub: Longden

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN002 |
| Site Address: | Land off Shrewsbury Road, Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.38 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 71 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is an agricultural field located to the north of Longden, immediately north of existing residential curtilages. Longden Road lies adjacent to the eastern boundary with hedgerows to the north. The southern boundary is defined by residential curtilages. The western boundary is not defined, crossing a field. |
| Surrounding Character: | Longden lies immediately S of the site (and partly to the W) with agricultural land to the E and N. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN003 |
| Site Address: | Land west of Well Mead Lane, Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.88 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 56 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is located to the W of Longden, adjacent to residential curtilage on its E boundary. Site appears to be fairly flat and triangular in shape, and is currently under agricultural use. Only access to the site is via a single track road to its N boundary. Its southern boundary is an agricultural field boundary. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural fields surround the site to the N, W and S, with residential to the E. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN005 |
| Site Address: | Land south of Summerhouse Lane, Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.05 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 92 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is located to the S of Longden, running adjacent to Summerhouse Lane and S of many large agricultural buildings. Site is slightly sloping and in agricultural use. The sites boundaries are defined by Summerhouse Lane to the north; a residential curtilage to the west; agricultural field boundaries to south; and agricultural field boundaries/property curtilages to the east. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural land to south, east and west (along with large rural dwellings on rural plots to east and west). Agricultural barn complex and dwellings to the north. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN006 |
| Site Address: | Land east of Hall Farm, Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 15.18 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 456 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consisting of a series of agricultural fields located to the E of Longden. The sites only potential access is off School Lane to the north of the site. The site is very large given the existing size of the existing built form of Longden, and access is far from the village itself. Site boundaries are defined by a combination of agricultural field boundaries, School Lane, a wooded belt and are undefined to the south. |
| Surrounding Character: | character to north, east and south is agricultural. Character to the west is a mix of agricultural fields and farm buildings. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN007 |
| Site Address: | Land north east of Summerhouse Lane, east of Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 4.36 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 131 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is located to the east of Longden, separated from the built form of the village. The site is currently for agricultural purposes and is fairly large in the context of Longden. Only access off a narrow road (Summerhouse Lane) which runs along the site's SW border. Site boundaries are primarily agricultural field boundaries. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding uses are agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement. Whilst there are other site promotions within this area of separation, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN008 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land East of Longden |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Longden |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 6.65 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 199 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | Site is located to the SE of Longden, far from the built form of the village. Site is currently for agricultural purposes and is fairly large in the context of Longden. Only access off a narrow road (School Lane) which runs along the site's S border. Site is bounded by hedgerows in all directions. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding character is agricultural. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Availability Unknown |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement. Whilst there are other site promotions within this area of separation, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN009 |
| Site Address: | Land adjacent to Village Hall, Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 6.82 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 204 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is located immediately E of the built form of Longden, and stretches eastwards away from the village. The site is mostly agricultural land, with Open Space land to the north-west. Access to the site is only off School Lane to the N, which is narrow and single carriage. The site is fairly flat throughout. The sites northern boundary is defined by School Lane in the majority, but in the north-western corner runs through an sports facility. The southern and eastern boundary is defined by a wooded belt/agricultural field boundary. Its western boundary is an agricultural field boundary (south) and property curtilage (north). |
| Surrounding Character: | Longden's built form (mostly residential) lies immediately to the W, with the village hall just outside the site's boundary. All other directions (S, N and E) comprise of agricultural land. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN011 |
| Site Address: | North of Plealey Lane, Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.61 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 18 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of the southern element of a large agricultural field. The site is located to the north-west of Longden. The sites northern, eastern and western boundaries are defined by agricultural field boundaries. The sites southern boundary is defined by Plealey Lane. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. However there is residential development beyond the small agricultural field to the east of the site. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN012 |
| Site Address: | Land Surrounding Longden Hall, Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.58 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 107 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of part of a large agricultural barn complex (which forms part of Hall Farm) and an agricultural field located to the east of Longden. The sites northern boundary is defined by property curtilages. The sites eastern boundary is defined by an agricultural field boundary. The sites western boundary is defined by property curtilages and Longden Road. The sites southern boundary in part runs through the barn complex and in part is an agricultural field boundary. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north and west is predominantly residential. Character to the south and east is predominantly agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN013 |
| Site Address: | Land East of Shrewsbury Road, Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 8.08 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 242 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of two large agricultural fields located to the north-east of Longden. Site boundaries are defined by property curtilages to the west, agricultural field boundaries to north and east and School Lane to the south. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, however there is ribbon residential development to the west, further residential development to the south-west and open space to the south. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN014 |
| Site Address: | Land off Little Barnyard, Plealey Lane, Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.45 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 13 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of part of an agricultural field located to the west and north of dwellings fronting onto Plealey Lane. The sites northern and western boundaries are defined by agricultural field boundaries. The sites southern boundary is defined by Plealey Lane and residential curtilages. The sites eastern boundary is undefined, crossing an agricultural field. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north, east and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the south is residential. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN015 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land adjacent Longden Primary School, Longden |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Longden |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.99 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 60 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site is irregularly shaped, consisting of parts of two agricultural fields. The site is located to the west of Longden. The site is bounded by areas of open space boundaries/agricultural field boundaries to the east; its southern boundary runs through two agricultural field boundaries; the sites western boundary is defined in part by an agricultural field boundary and in part runs through agricultural fields; its northern boundary is defined by Plealey Lane/agricultural field boundaries/property curtilage. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to north and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is a mix of agricultural, residential and open space. Character to the south is agricultural, beyond which it is residential. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN016 |
| Site Address: | Land adjacent Longden Primary School, Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.46 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 104 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is irregularly shaped, consisting of parts of two agricultural fields. The site is located to the west of Longden. The site is bounded by areas of open space boundaries/agricultural field boundaries to the east; its southern boundary runs through two agricultural field boundaries; the sites western boundary is defined in part by an agricultural field boundary and in part runs through agricultural fields; its northern boundary is defined by Plealey Lane/agricultural field boundaries/property curtilage. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to north and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is a mix of agricultural, residential and open space. Character to the south is agricultural, beyond which it is residential. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN017 |
| Site Address: | Land south of Holland House, Longden Road, Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.36 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 11 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site is linear running south along Longden Road. It constitutes part of a wider agricultural field. The sites western boundary is defined by Longden Road. The sites southern boundary is defined by a residential curtilage. The sites northern boundary is defined by an agricultural field boundary. The sites eastern boundary is undefined, running through an agricultural field. |
| Surrounding Character: | surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, however there are some rural dwellings to the west of the site and to the north is a tennis court (which appear to now be redundant). |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN018 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Summerhouse Lane, east of Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.23 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 7 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A linear site, consisting of a small part of a larger agricultural field located to the east of Longden. The sites boundaries are undefined to north, east and west (albeit it is understood land to the west has recently received Planning Permission). The southern boundary is defined by Summerhouse Lane. |
| Surrounding Character: | surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, apart from a row of residential dwellings to the south. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement. Whilst there are other site promotions within this area of separation, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN019 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south of Longden |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Longden |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 0.28 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 8 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of part of an agricultural field. Site boundaries are undefined as the site is surrounded by the wider agricultural field. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Suitable |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement and does not have a road frontage. The area of the site is already included within a separate site (LON005) that could provide a road frontage and greater relationship to the built form of the settlement. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN020 |
| Site Address: | Land east of Golden Arrow Court, School Lane, Longden |
| Settlement: | Longden |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.58 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 17 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A linear site consisting of the southern part of a larger agricultural field. The site is located to the north-east of Longden. The sites southern boundary is defined by School Lane. The sites eastern boundary is defined by an agricultural field boundary. The sites western boundary is defined by property curtilages. The sites northern boundary is undefined, running across an agricultural field. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to north and east is predominantly agricultural. Character to the south is predominantly open space. Character to the west is primarily residential. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Community Hub: Nesscliffe

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES001 |
| Site Address: | Land North of Broomhill, Nesscliffe |
| Settlement: | Nesscliffe |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.92 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 118 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site near Nesscliffe at foot of Nesscliffe Hill Country Park. Site is currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site has agricultural land to W, E, and S and forested area of Nesscliffe Hill Country park to N; also to SE is Broomhill farm complex. Site boundaries are clearly defined to N by trees and hedgerows with Nesscliffe Hill; to S by hedgerow and old A5; to W by hedgerows and trees; however boundary to E is not clearly defined and is arbitrary line dividing field. Site has road frontage to old A5 and current vehicle access from form adjacent field via old A5. Pedestrian and cycle access via same route to established network - pavement provision. |
| Surrounding Character: | Mixed rural/countryside in appearance with some buildings present but dominated by woodland of Nesscliffe Country Park |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES002 |
| Site Address: | Land east of Nesscliffe Hotel, Nesscliffe |
| Settlement: | Nesscliffe |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.82 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 54 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site near Nesscliffe at foot of Nesscliffe Hill Country Park. Site is currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site has agricultural land to E and forested area of Nesscliffe Hill Country park to N; to S and E are individual residential properties. Site boundaries are clearly defined to N by trees and hedgerows with Nesscliffe Hill; to S by hedgerow and old A5 and Nesscliffe Hotel; to W and E by hedgerows and trees. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to old A5. Pedestrian and cycle access via same route to established network - pavement provision. |
| Surrounding Character: | Mixed rural/countryside in appearance with some buildings present but dominated by woodland of Nesscliffe Country Park |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES003 |
| Site Address: | Land east of Nesscliffe |
| Settlement: | Nesscliffe |
| Site Size (Ha): | 4.32 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 130 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site on N edge of Nesscliffe to E of residential estate development of The Crescent and individual properties on Hopton Lane, also to E of primary school and W (adjoining) Nesscliffe LWS and Country Park. Site has clearly boundaries on all sides defined by trees and hedgerows and by Hopton Lane to W and Nesscliffe Country Park to E. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to Hopton Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via same route (pavement provision) to established links. S portion of site had outline app (14/03819/OUT) for 8 bungalows withdrawn in Jan 2015. |
| Surrounding Character: | Rural settlement in appearance but dominated by woodland of Nesscliffe Country Park |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES005 |
| Site Address: | Land south of Well Lane, north of Nesscliffe |
| Settlement: | Nesscliffe |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.19 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 96 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside and away from N edge of hub settlement of Nesscliffe. Site currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site is N part of larger NES005 with promoted site NES16 to S. Site boundaries are clearly defined on N,W, and E sides by hedgerows and trees, N boundary also to Well Lane. However S boundary to NES016 is not defined. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to Well Lane and also road frontage to old A5. Pedestrian and cycle access via same route to established network - no pavement provision on Well Lane or old A5 at this point. |
| Surrounding Character: | Open countryside in agricultural use. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES007 |
| Site Address: | Land at Nesscliffe St Andrews CE School, Nesscliffe |
| Settlement: | Nesscliffe |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.35 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 40 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site to N of primary school. Currently in use as formal outdoor recreation and children's play area. Site has primary school and playing fields to S and further agricultural land to N, E and W. Site boundaries are clearly defined by hedgerows and mature established trees on all sides. Site has road frontage and informal vehicle access to Hopton Lane, alternative formal vehicle access via The Crescent. Pedestrian and cycle access via same routes to established network - pavement provision on both The Crescent and Hopton Lane (from primary school). |
| Surrounding Character: | largely open countryside overlooked by wooded presence of Nesscliffe Hill. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site consists of an identified outdoor sports facility and children's playground. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES009X |
| Site Address: | Land at The White House, Nesscliffe |
| Settlement: | Nesscliffe |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.16 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 5 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | |
| Surrounding Character: | |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: Size²: Strategic Suitability³: |
| | As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.2ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES011 |
| Site Address: | Land between Nesscliffe and Wilcott |
| Settlement: | Nesscliffe |
| Site Size (Ha): | 9.63 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 289 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of two large and irregularly shaped agricultural fields located between Nesscliffe and Wilcott, but separated from the built form of Nesscliffe by the A5. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character to north and south is predominantly agricultural land. Character to the west is predominantly residential. Character to the east is wooded (running parallel to the A5) beyond this it is agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site is remote from the built form of the settlement, separated by land that has not been promoted for consideration. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES012 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land at Broomhill, south of Nesscliffe |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Nesscliffe |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 2.30 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 69 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of part of an agricultural field located to the south of Nesscliffe. Site boundaries are defined by agricultural field boundaries to north, north-east and west. The southern boundary is defined by a road. Its south-eastern boundary is undefined, running across an agricultural. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Surrounding character is a mix of agricultural and woodland. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES013 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Nesscliffe |
| Settlement: | Nesscliffe |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.84 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 55 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | the site consists of part of an agricultural field located to the north of Nesscliffe. The sites northern and southern boundaries are defined by roads. The sites western boundary is defined by agricultural/open space field boundaries. The sites eastern boundary is undefined, running through an agricultural field. |
| Surrounding Character: | surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, although there is an areas of open space to the south-west of the site. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | Availability¹: |
| | Size²: |
| | Strategic Suitability³: In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES014 |
| Site Address: | Land west of Nesscliffe |
| Settlement: | Nesscliffe |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.99 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 60 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of two agricultural fields located to the west of Nesscliffe. Site boundaries to north and south are agricultural field boundaries. The western boundary is defined by the wooded belt along the A5. The eastern boundary is defined by property curtilages. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to north and south is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is residential. Character to the west is a mix of woodland (either side of the A5) and agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES015 |
| Site Address: | Land at Nesscliffe Cottages, Nesscliffe |
| Settlement: | Nesscliffe |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.24 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 37 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The sites consists of a wooded area and the northern element of an agricultural field. The site lies to the south of Nesscliffe. The sites northern boundary is defined by a road, its western boundary is defined by a property curtilage/edge of the wooded area, its eastern boundary is defined by a hedgerow field boundary. Its southern boundary is defined by the extent of the wooded area for 2/3 of the site but is undefined for the remaining 1/3 of the site, running through an agricultural field. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to north, south and east is predominantly agricultural, although some of the land to the south has the benefit of Planning Permission for residential development. Character to the west is primarily residential. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES016 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Nesscliffe |
| Settlement: | Nesscliffe |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.66 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 80 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The sites consists of parts of two large agricultural fields split by the main road through Nesscliffe. The site is located to the north of Nesscliffe. The sites northern and southern boundaries are undefined running through agricultural fields, however the southern boundary does represent the extent of a current Planning Application. The sites eastern boundary is defined by the road (for the western portion of the site) and an area of open space (for the eastern portion of the site). The sires western boundary is defined by the road (for the eastern portion of the site) but is undefined for the eastern portion of the site, running through an agricultural field. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, apart from an area of open space to the east of the site. However land to the south does have Planning Permission for residential development. |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES017 |
| <i>Site Address:</i> | Land south of White House, Nesscliffe |
| <i>Settlement:</i> | Nesscliffe |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i> | 1.00 |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i> | 30 |
| <i>Type of Site:</i> | Greenfield |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i> | N/A |
| <i>General Description:</i> | The site consists of the majority of an agricultural field located to the south of Nesscliffe. |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i> | Character to the south and west is woodland associated with the A5 corridor, beyond the A5 character is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is a mixture of woodland and agricultural, although there are also several dwellings. Character to the north is a mix of residential and woodland. |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| <i>Availability Information¹:</i> | Currently Available |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i> | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES018 |
| Site Address: | Land south-east of Old Nesscliffe Hotel, Nesscliffe |
| Settlement: | Nesscliffe |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.56 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 17 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of part of a wider agricultural field located to the south-east of Nesscliffe. Site boundaries are defined by the road to the south, the curtilage of Old Nesscliffe Hotel to the west, but are undefined to the north and east. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is a mix of residential (north and west) and agricultural (east and south). |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | N/A |
| Availability Information¹: | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Conclusion: | |
| Availability¹: | |
| Size²: | |
| Strategic Suitability³: | The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Shrewsbury Place Plan Area
Stage 3 Detailed Site Review:
Site Assessments**

Strategic Centre: Shrewsbury

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | BIT026 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 6% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | B4380 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Subject to the introduction of a suitable access junction and review and extension of the existing speed limit. Potentially 457 homes |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. The B4380 at this location still has the appearance of a high speed inter urban main road. Significant changes to the appearance of the section of B4380 between Bicton Village and Shrewsbury will be necessary before this and a number of other sites along the B4380 are developed. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Developable area reduced by possible presence of priority habitats, hedgerows and Env. Network. Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) of Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | The southern sections of the site (Calcott Moss and associated water course, previously LWS) are within the Env. Network, connected to the core area of Oxon Pool LWS. If priority habitats are present then these areas will need to be retained and appropriately buffered, along with the hedgerows and trees. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (records in ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, water voles, otters and nesting birds. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Potential to restore priority habitats of Calcott Moss and maintain key arm of the Environmental Network. See accompanying document. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant field and boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to north creating noise. Agricultural building (?) on the west boundary. Commercial to east. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. Additional separation away from agricultural and commercial activities on the site perimeter to ensure no impacts on existing buildings. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Significant site located between Shrewsbury and Bicton. Could accommodate 300+ dwellings. 10% of site in 1,000 year surface flood risk zone. New access required off Holyhead Road. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Whilst the site is relatively free of on-site constraints and safe access is considered achievable, the site is considered to be divorced from the urban edge of Shrewsbury and represents a fairly isolated countryside location. As such there are significant concerns over the site's overall sustainability, particularly in relation how the site could encourage the use of sustainable transport modes. In addition the site's proximity to Bicton, along with the scale of growth proposed, raises concern as to the site's impact on the character of the village. It is envisaged the allocated SUE West situated to the south of the proposed site will be developed over the next 15 years and therefore it is not envisaged the site's proximity to Shrewsbury's urban edge will improve until much later in the plan period. It is considered there are far more sustainable options closer to the urban edge capable of delivering major sustainable greenfield land releases.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR011 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Potentially 27 homes with access onto Belvidere Avenue. The site includes sufficient land to create an appropriate standard estate road junction and access link from the existing highway. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Woodland, boundary trees and buildings may support protected species like bats and birds. Badger may have setts here. Several trees on site and on the borders are protected by TPOs. Grassland may also have interest. The woodland is already used as informal accessible natural greenspace and accessed from the path to the south. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation may be required. Buffers to the woodland replacement planting for any trees removed. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retained woodland be retained and could be enhanced by selective thinning and understory planting. Better routes through the wood could be provided that link to the path to the south of the site. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Likely impact on setting of Grade II Listed The Elms, particularly as site includes its former park-like grounds |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LB). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Many mature trees on site (TPO) |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Very low density with retention of mature trees |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No notable constraints. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is within the existing and proposed development boundary and as such has potential to be considered as windfall development. However, the site assessment has raised concern over the impact on both Grade II listed building (the Elms) and mature trees on site. The site is approximately 500m from the nearest supermarket and regular bus service and 1.0km from the nearest primary school. There is a good pedestrian and cycle network in the vicinity. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Heritage assessment required. Mature trees should be retained. Lower density development likely to be required to make development acceptable. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p style="text-align: center;">The site can be considered on its merits through a planning application as part of the windfall allowance</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR015 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Potentially 30 homes or more if apartments are developed. Existing access link onto Monkmoor Road would benefit from some improvement which would be necessary if it was to become adopted highway. There may be some historical constraints on improvements. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss (possibly others). Otherwise none |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EciA required. Bats are likely in the buildings and perhaps nesting birds. Swifts in particular should be checked for. A scarce plant associated with brownfield sites has been recorded on site. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation may be required. Mature tree on boundaries should be retained. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Green roofs should be required that also incorporate 'brown-roof' (very thin soils or rubble) aspects that help replace the conditions needed for the rare plant found here. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Highly sensitive site that falls wholly within Shrewsbury Conservation Area and includes Grade II* Listed Whitehall mansion (NHLE ref. 1254660), together with the associated Grade II Listed dovecote (NHLE ref. 1270676) & outbuildings (NHLE ref. 1270688). Also within setting of Grade II* Listed Whitehall Gatehouse (NHLE ref. 1254671) and attached Grade II listed boundary wall. Site considered to have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs & CA, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | Any scheme should include conservation of dovecote. High quality, well designed scheme has potential to enhance the character and appearance of the CA and settings of LBs over existing 1960s/ 70s office building. |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Occasional mature trees and adjacent trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible contaminated land from past building uses on site but site not recorded as a site with possible contamination. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Assessment of the site past uses may suggest no likely con land. If not remediation likely to be available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | Improve amenity for surrounding residential properties. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site considered a potential windfall site. No significant constraints identified. The site is less than 500m from the nearest convenience store, 1.0km from the nearest primary school and adjacent the Monkmoor Road where regular bus services can be accessed. There is a good pedestrian and cycle network in the vicinity. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is within the defined development boundary and therefore can be considered on its merits through a planning application as part of the windfall allowance.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR019 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Very High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Potentially 48 homes. Access would be via Montgomery Way and a simple T-junction onto Sundorne Road which should have capacity to take additional traffic. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss (possibly others). An internationally significant population of GCN is present adjacent to this site. The site in question is part of the mitigation land set aside when the medical centre was created and so can't now be developed. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Habitat would require survey as this may be priority habitat which would be protected under MD12 and CS17 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | There are no ways under current legislation that this site could be developed |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Screening belt of trees to south curtilage and occasional scattered trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible noise from sports pitches to the east. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Glazing and boundary treatment would resolve any noise concern. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site has Great Crested Newts present on site. Landscape sensitivity is high. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | Due to the presence of great crested newts and the high landscape sensitivity this site should not be considered for allocation. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR023 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Site has potential to deliver around 650 dwellings. The current levels of traffic on Ellesmere Road and on the A49 bypass north of Sundorne Road roundabout constrain major development in the north of Shrewsbury and these sites should only be brought forward once the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been secured. The scheme provide alternative routes for existing traffic which reduce the current pressures on Ellesmere Road and the A49 bypass creating additional capacity for major development in north Shrewsbury. The potential new road will also provide a strategic access route through these sites.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere, Hencott Pool and Clarepool Moss (possibly others) and possible recreation impacts in-combination on Hencott Pool Ramsar. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. A small pond is present on the eastern boundary with the road which would need checking for GCN and other protected species. An ephemeral pool not marked on Ordnance Survey is present to the west and beyond this at 170m is a large more permanent water body. Standing water is occasional in the lower lying north eastern end of the site. Infield and boundary trees would require assessment for breeding birds and bats. Hedgerows are a priority habitat and would also support nesting birds. A thin band of woodland is present on the western side. This is corridor habitat that is protected under MD12 and CS17 and could be home to protected species including badgers, reptiles and amphibians</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation may be required if GCN or other protected species are found. The hedgerows and mature trees should be retained. The hedge could feasibly be moved to the northern boundary of this site. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The damp northern area could provide a useful open water and / or wetland area. The woodland area could be enhanced to improve the |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Potential effect on setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033). No known archaeological interest but very large site size suggests there may be wider archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Poultry Farm to the west only 215m away from the site. This may cause significant odour and noise issues particularly in summer months. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise from the A528 to the east and road to the south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | This is a large greenfield site and would represent a major expansion of the town to the north west. However, ahead of the development of the proposed NWRR it is considered the current highway network has major constraints, especially in relation to the level of traffic on Ellesmere Road and the A49 by-pass north of Sundorne Road roundabout. The Shrewsbury Battlefield Heritage Assessment shows that all or part of this site makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Registered Battlefield. In this respect, its sensitivity to change is moderate and whilst development is likely to cause harm to the designated heritage asset, this could be reduced or avoided through careful siting and sensitive design. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Strategic and local highway considerations. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Not appropriate to allocate land ahead of the development of the NWRR due to significant levels of congestion on Ellesmere Road. The Shrewsbury Battlefield Heritage Assessment shows that all or part of this site makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Registered Battlefield. In this respect, its sensitivity to change is moderate and whilst development is likely to cause harm to the designated heritage asset, this could be reduced or avoided through careful siting and sensitive design.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR027 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. The majority of Nobold Lane (north of Mousecroft Lane) is not fronted by one of these sites so no improvements could be delivered without third party land. Together they would need to provide a new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. This is particularly important as there is not direct access to the A5 bypass from Longden Road and the level of development that could be accommodated by the Longden Road route going north east to Roman Road will be limited by existing highway capacity.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss (possibly others). If the grassland is of interest the area available for development may be too small to make this viable. Similarly if significant populations of newts are present this will reduce the amount of land available for development.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Large areas of the pasture are labelled as 'semi-improved grassland' and therefore close to priority / core habitat. Two ponds are present on site with two more ponds found within 125m of the site. These could support GCN. Bats and birds are likely to use in-field and boundary trees in addition to the buildings. Badgers, reptiles and other protected species are also reasonably likely.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation may be required if GCN or other protected species are found. The hedgerows and mature trees should be retained. If the grassland is of interest the area available for development may be significantly smaller |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Opportunities should be sought to create large areas of greenspace using contributions from other development proposals nearby. Ponds and in-field trees should be buffered and enhanced for biodiversity and public access. Remaining areas of grassland should not be re-turfed but enhanced with green hay strewing and management as traditional hay meadow. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site would be detached from existing built edge of town. Site includes, and would potentially impact on the setting of, the Grade II Listed Newton farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1176148). Site crossed by the projected line of a possible Roman road (HER PRN 00057). No other known archaeological interest but very large site size suggests there may be wider archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of LB; DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | BS 5837: 2012 Arboricultural impact assessment must be undertaken and the tree constraints and opportunities used to inform site layout design. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise from the A5 to the south and additional road to the north west. Noise, odour and dusts a potential from farm on site. Some historic features on site that may require contaminated land investigation. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road and farm if it is retained. Con land remediation likely to be available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Poor |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site has potential to be part of a large strategic allocation, although it is recognised further heritage assessment is necessary. Improvement to local highway network required and impact on Strategic road network will need to be assessed. Promoted land to the south of Hanwood Road up to Longden Road offers the opportunity to consider a strategic comprehensive proposal in this direction, although it is acknowledged there are a number of different landowners and there is no known promotion agreement. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Strategic and local highway considerations, heritage assessment. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Whilst the site has potential to be part of a frontage into a much larger strategic allocation between the Hanwood Road and Longden Road, it is considered there is no requirement to release this land at this time in order to meet the proposed development needs of the town up to 2036, and in isolation this site is divorced from the existing built edge of the town. Land to the north between Hanwood Road and Mytton Oak road is preferred for a major expansion of the town in order to meet a significant proportion of development needs up to 2036. It is felt the preferred site offers greater potential benefits to the town and can support the objectives of the Big Town Plan and to achieve a comprehensively planned development.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR031 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites represent a significant level of development (potentially 3,000 homes) in a location where the local highway network is close to capacity at peak times. Specifically the development would add to the existing congestion on the A49 bypass between the A53 and Sundorne Road. It is unlikely that the congestion can be mitigated. Development of this scale in the location is unlikely to be acceptable in highways terms until the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been completed.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss (possibly others). Otherwise none.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Two ponds are present nearby. One to the north in woodland, and more importantly one in the open field to the south. Grassland may be of interest (on some aerial photos it appears to have ridge and furrow that historic environment should check out). Boundary trees are likely to support bats and birds.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Grassland would require survey between May and August. Some level of mitigation may be required if GCN are found in the ponds. The existing good hedges and boundary trees should be retained and a good buffer provided. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Hedges could be turned into thin woodland to enhance the environmental network. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Mature Curtilage trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retain existing trees |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible contaminated land off site which may impact on the site (small landfill area). |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Remediation likely to be available if required. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Poor |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is divorced from the settlement and should only come forward if other sites to the south are also preferred. There are also outstanding concerns relating to the heritage impact on the Registered Battlefield and the impact to the on-site dense woodland to the north of the site. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is divorced from the settlement and should only come forward if other sites to the south are also preferred. There are also outstanding concerns relating to the heritage impact on the Registered Battlefield and the impact to the on-site dense woodland to the north of the site.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR032 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>The current levels of traffic on Ellesmere Road and on the A49 bypass north of Sundorne Road roundabout constrain major development in the north of Shrewsbury and these sites should only be brought forward once the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been secured. The scheme provide alternative routes for existing traffic which reduce the current pressures on Ellesmere Road and the A49 bypass creating additional capacity for major development in north Shrewsbury. The new road will also provide a strategic access route through these sites.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere, Hencott Pool and Clarepool Moss (possibly others) and for possible recreation impacts in-combination on Hencott Pool. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. Otherwise none.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. Corridor habitat that is protected under MD12 and CS17 runs around all sides of this side except the western boundary. This is partly due to a water course that runs along the north and east boundaries. A pond is present near the southern boundary which would need checking for GCN and other protected species - including Tubular Water-dropwort, a UK Priority Species. Infield and boundary trees would require assessment for breeding birds and bats. Hedgerows are a priority habitat and would also support nesting birds. Polecat, a UK Priority Species, has been recorded on site. These species like the cover of hedgerows and scrub.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation may be required if GCN or other protected species are found. The hedgerows and mature trees infield and the boundary should be retained. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | A feature could be made of the pond, the water course to the east and the hedgerow that links the pond to the eastern edge. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Site likely to harm setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033) and Grade II* Listed Albright Hussey (NHLE ref. 1295586) . May have archaeological interest relating to the battle. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield and LBs; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retain existing trees |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from roads to west and south. Potential noise from commercial estate to the south of road to the south of the site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site could come forward with SHR186 as a comprehensive development. However, the site is to the north of the A5 and therefore this would establish a direction of growth beyond a current defined and defensible boundary. In addition there are significant heritage concerns raised over the impact of development on the setting of the Registered Battlefield and to the Grade II* listed Albright Hussey. The Shrewsbury Battlefield Heritage Assessment shows that this site makes a strongly positive contribution to the significance of the Registered Battlefield. In this respect, the site's sensitivity to change is high and it is unlikely that development could take place without causing substantial harm to the designated heritage asset. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Impact on setting of Registered Battlefield and listed building. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | The site would establish a direction of growth beyond a current defined and defensible boundary. In light of more sustainable options to the west of the town it is not felt necessary to breach the by-pass in this direction in this plan period. In addition there are significant highway and heritage concerns, in particular on the setting of the Registered Battlefield and to the Grade II* listed Albright Hussey. The Shrewsbury Battlefield Heritage Assessment shows that this site makes a strongly positive contribution to the significance of the Registered Battlefield. In this respect, the site's sensitivity to change is high and it is unlikely that development could take place without causing substantial harm to the designated heritage asset. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR044 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 13% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 18% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>This site is part of a group of sites to the north of A49/A53 Battlefield Roundabout in a location where the local highway network is close to capacity at peak times. Specifically the development would add to the existing congestion on the A49 bypass between the A53 and Sundorne Road. It is unlikely that the congestion can be mitigated. Development of this scale in the location is unlikely to be acceptable in highways terms until the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been completed.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss (possibly others). If the grassland (pasture) in the northern half is of interest the area available for development may be too small to make this viable. The existing woodland is core habitat so this would also reduce the overall area available</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Woodland to north is priority / core habitat and protected by MD12 and CS17. Grassland in northern block may also be priority / core habitat. The two ponds to the west of the railway line would require assessment for GCN. GCN have been recorded in two ponds to the east. The road barrier may mean they don't forage on the site but a rail line is less of a barrier and some land set aside for mitigation may be required. A small water course runs along the far southern boundary.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Grassland would require survey between May and August. The arable portion in the south does not require survey. Some level of mitigation may be required if GCN are found in the ponds over the rail line. The existing good hedges and boundary / in-field trees should be retained and a good buffer provided. Water course to the south should be buffered and ideally opened up, increasing it's capacity. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The woodland in the north could be enhanced the rail line could be buffered to enhance this existing environmental corridor. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Site likely to harm setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033) and Grade II* Battlefield Church (NHLE ref. 1246192) . May have archaeological interest relating to the battle. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield and LBs; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Northern third of site is dense woodland |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Lower site has screen of trees to railway only |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from road to the east and rail to the west. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road and rail. However the northern end of the site is so slender it may not be practicably useable for residential with mitigation. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Poor |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is divorced from the settlement and should only come forward if SHR195 is preferred. There are also outstanding concerns relating to the heritage impact on the Registered Battlefield and the impact to the on-site dense woodland to the north of the site. The Shrewsbury Battlefield Heritage Assessment shows that all or part of this site makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Registered Battlefield. In this respect, its sensitivity to change is moderate and whilst development is likely to cause harm to the designated heritage asset, this could be reduced or avoided through careful siting and sensitive design. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is divorced from the settlement and should only come forward if SHR195 is preferred. There are also outstanding concerns relating to the heritage impact on the Registered Battlefield and the impact to the dense woodland to the north of the site. The Shrewsbury Battlefield Heritage Assessment shows that all or part of this site makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Registered Battlefield. In this respect, its sensitivity to change is moderate and whilst development is likely to cause harm to the designated heritage asset, this could be reduced or avoided through careful siting and sensitive design.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR046 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 20% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>This site is part of a group of sites to the north of A49/A53 Battlefield Roundabout in a location where the local highway network is close to capacity at peak times. Specifically the development would add to the existing congestion on the A49 bypass between the A53 and Sundorne Road. It is unlikely that the congestion can be mitigated. Development of this scale in the location is unlikely to be acceptable in highways terms until the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been completed.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss (possibly others). GCN have been recorded in the pond. The area of land required for mitigation may make this site unviable.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Pond supports GCN and other amphibians which mean the pond is core habitat. Large trees, other vegetation and buildings may support birds and bats. Reptiles are also possible</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Terrestrial foraging habitat for the GCN would need to be provided. Other mitigation for birds and bats may be required. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Potential effect on setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Dense tree planting to front and back of site |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Area of open space central to the site |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Possible very low density residential retaining mature trees |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to the west creating noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Poor |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is divorced from the settlement and should only come forward if SHR195 is preferred. There are also outstanding concerns relating the impact to the on-site dense woodland to the north of the site. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | The site is divorced from the settlement and should only come forward if SHR195 is preferred. There are also outstanding concerns relating to the impact to the dense woodland to the north of the site. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR053 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 12% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 35% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Potentially 24 homes. Access would be via a new junction onto Ellesmere Road. This site would be infill between establish housing and recent development. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | GCN - medium population is present in the pool on site. Reptiles like grass snake are also likely. Badgers may use areas just off site. Grassland may be of interest and if core or corridor habitat would require consideration under CS17 and MD12. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | EclA required |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Enhancements to the pool and potentially to any remaining grassland areas |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site on edge of historic suburb of Greenfields |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | Appropriate design necessary |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Few trees - ponds present on western side |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to east is a noise source. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site has potential for residential development on a relatively small scale, although this would need to address the ecology concerns raised regarding the presence of Great Crested Newts. The site has been subject to a recent application (17/05772/OUT) which was refused on the basis the site is outside the current development boundary; the impact on local character;, concern regarding the overdevelopment of the area; and over the scale and massing of the proposal. This refusal is currently subject to appeal. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Ecological mitigation resulting from GCN population. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Within the context of the Local Plan Review it is not considered necessary to allocate this site in order to meet the development needs of the town to 2036. However, it is acknowledged that due to existing development further north of this site it is appropriate to consider moving the development boundary to include both the approved scheme and this site. However, it will continue to be necessary for any proposal on this land to address ecological mitigation and to address concerns over the scale and massing of development.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR054a |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Very High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Access would either be via existing private lane (to Pimley Manor) which would need to be improved to estate road standards, or by using existing access through the Shrewsbury Club. The simple T-junction onto Sundorne Road would also need to be improved to the relevant visibility standards which may not be possible without securing third party land.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Corridor habitat of the Environmental Network surrounds this site on 3 sides and includes the woodland planting along the eastern boundary with the road. An aquatic feature just past the northern boundary may support protected species including Great Crested Newts - unless this is a flowing ditch. Boundary and in-field trees may support bats and nesting birds. Badger may also have setts in the woodland strip to the east and south. The woodland to the south and south west corner is designated as Sundorne Canal (Great Crested Newt Site) Local Wildlife Site.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | ECLA required - in particular to check the more mature trees and the water feature to the north. Other checks for ponds in the vicinity should be made considering the internationally important population of GCN not far to the west. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The existing environmental network could be buffered and enhanced |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site adjacent to former Shrewsbury Canal to south (HER PRN 03410) |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Address canal through appropriate design. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | occasional tree on site important belts of trees adjacent to east and south curtilages |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to east is a noise source. Some potential noise from sports ground and facilities to the north. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road and sports ground. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Shropshire Council's Landscape sensitivity assessment considers this site to be of medium/high sensitivity for residential use. The site promoter has provided additional site specific landscape sensitivity considerations which considers the site within its immediate context, as a well contained option within the wider landscape parcel. It is considered the site's containment mitigates the wider impact on the integrity of the assessed parcel. The site promoter has also clarified access arrangements, with the potential to include a vehicular access through the car park of the Shrewsbury Club. Whilst the site is located on the periphery of the town, the location offers the opportunity to provide a pedestrian route from the Shropshire Way footpath to Sundorne Road as part of the site's green infrastructure contribution. Landscape buffering with the Shrewsbury Canal will be required, and there are more sustainable options to allocate, particularly to the west on the town. The site offers a moderately scaled option, which would complement the other proposed development options for the town. There is potential for early delivery. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Allocate for residential |
| Reasoning | <p>Shropshire Council's Landscape sensitivity assessment considers this site to be of medium/high sensitivity for residential use. The site promoter has provided additional site specific landscape sensitivity considerations which considers the site within its immediate context, as a well contained option within the wider landscape parcel. It is considered the site's containment mitigates the wider impact on the integrity of the assessed parcel. The site promoter has also clarified access arrangements, with the potential to include a vehicular access through the car park of the Shrewsbury Club. Whilst the site is located on the periphery of the town, the location offers the opportunity to provide a pedestrian route from the Shropshire Way footpath to Sundorne Road as part of the site's green infrastructure contribution. Landscape buffering with the Shrewsbury Canal will be required, and there are more sustainable options to allocate, particularly to the west on the town. The site offers a moderately scaled option, which would complement the other proposed development options for the town. There is potential for early delivery.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | 60 |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>Appropriate access from Sundorne Road. Potential for compensatory car parking at the Shrewsbury Club if required. Improvements to local highway network. Pedestrian access to Shrewsbury Way and appropriate buffering with former Shrewsbury Canal and the environmental network surrounding it.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR054b |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 99% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Access onto A49 bypass or B5062 would be close to the existing Sundorne Roundabout so a review of this junction would be needed to determine the most appropriate junction arrangement for this site and SHR054c. There are existing congestion problems at the A49 bypass Sundorne Roundabout which would need to be addressed by this and other developments in the vicinity. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Sundorne Pool Local Wildlife Site (and Env. Network core area) lies adjacent to the eastern (and part of the southern) boundary. The northern boundary lies adjacent to the northern boundary. Sufficient buffers from the boundaries will be required. Requires botanical survey, ECLA and surveys for bats (trees and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impact on settings of Grade II listed Gatehouse to Sundorne Castle (NHLE ref. 1177292) and Chapel to Sundorne Castle (NHLE ref. 1366956). Site also located in former historic parkland for Sundorne Castle (HER PRN 07706). No known archaeology but large size of site suggests it may have wider archaeological potential. Site detached from existing built edge of town. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LB; impact on character and appearance of former parkland; archaeological DBA +?evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Large field site with good boundary hedges (appear to be excluded?) Wooded area to east |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for sustainable planting of large trees along the boundaries to integrate this prominent site into the landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from road to west. Air quality concerns close to road, particularly junction. Possible con land issues due to off site contamination nearby. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Air quality mitigation through stand off distances to the road (assessment will show distance required). |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | Development beyond the A49 to the east is a major new direction of growth. Heritage impacts. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site would represent a new direction of growth for the town to the east of the A49 by-pass, which is considered to cause a significant degree of physical and perceived severance from the main urban area. Concern has also been raised regarding the impact on the highway network given existing levels of congestion on the A49/A53, and over the heritage impact on Sundorne Castle. It is not considered necessary to grow the town in this new direction, especially in the light of the availability of more sustainable options to the west of the town.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR054c |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 37% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 59% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 41% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 16% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 57% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 68% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 39% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | High and Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High and Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Very High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Access onto A49 bypass or B5062 would be close to the existing Sundorne Roundabout so a review of this junction would be needed to determine the most appropriate junction arrangement for this site and SHR054b. There are existing congestion problems at the A49 bypass Sundorne Roundabout which would need to be addressed by this and other developments in the vicinity.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. If priority habitats not present, the Env. Network will require a significant buffer, vastly reducing the developable area.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>The majority of the site is Env. Network corridor and may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats (trees and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, otters, water voles and nesting birds. A PROW crosses the site.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | If priority habitat, site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. An important arm of the Env. Network covers at least the southern half of the site. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site crossed by outlet channels from Sundorne Pool, a former ornamental lake (HER PRN 08283) that formed part of the historic parkland for Sundorne Castle (HER PRN 07706). Medium size of site suggests it may otherwise have archaeological potential. Site detached from existing built edge of town. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application archaeological DBA (+?evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Part open field part heavily tree'd site |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Open areas |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to the west and north. Poss. con land to north and south from past land use. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. Con land remediation likely to be available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site to the east of A49 by pass and would be a major new direction of growth for the town. Site part of the Environmental Network |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site would represent a new direction of growth for the town to the east of the A49 by-pass, which is considered to cause a significant degree of physical and perceived severance from the main urban area. Concern has also been raised regarding the impact on the highway network given existing levels of congestion on the A49/A53, and over the ecological impact of the site given its location within part of the Environmental Network. It is not considered necessary to grow the town in this new direction, especially in the light of the availability of more sustainable options to the west of the town.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR057 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 12% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 88% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites have good access onto Gains Park Way which connects with the Welshpool Road to the north and the Mytton Oak Road to the south and onto the SRN. SHR177 could deliver 1,545 homes and SHR177 is promoted as a small employment site. Land would be available from the sites to deliver a series of appropriate type junctions and pedestrian and cycle infrastructure that connects to the existing network in the area.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required to check all ponds on site for full range of protected species in addition to mature trees, buildings, badger Setts, hedgerows, water course. Pasture may be species rich grassland that would be Core or corridor habitat. The Bowbrook runs through this area with much of this being in Flood Zones 2 or 3. GCN have been recorded in the area including a pond directly adjacent to the eastern side at Earl's View. Several Badger records have been made in the area so setts are likely in the area. Otters are known to use the Bowbrook as a corridor and a number of otter deaths have been recorded on the A5 bypass as a result of insufficiently large culverts under the road. There are a large number of mature trees within and bordering this site. Tree Preservation Orders are listed for several trees along the eastern boundary.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network that crosses and surrounds much of site in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. The Bowbrook should be fully buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | A feature should be created of the Bowbrook. Save passage for otters under or over the A5 should be installed or a means of preventing them from crossing the road. This could also provide a better crossing for people. A green bridge. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site includes two potential prehistoric cropmark enclosures (HER PRNs 02126 & 04233). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | BS 5837: 2012 Arboricultural impact assessment must be undertaken and the tree constraints and opportunities used to inform site layout design. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | A5 to the west and other road along south boundary are noise sources with the junction of these two roads creating a possible air quality concern. Potential contaminated land from past land uses a potential. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road to avoid noise issues and stand off distance to road junction to avoid air quality impacts. Con land likely to have remediation available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site represents a major opportunity for greenfield release on the edge of Shrewsbury between the existing built form (Gains Park) and the A5, consisting of around 25ha. The full extent of the promoted land consists of over 50ha, but it is not considered all this land is necessary to meet development needs up to 2036. The site is well contained to the west (A5), east (Gains park) and south (Mytton oak Road). The site has good potential for access onto Gains Park Way which connects with the Welshpool Road to the north and the Mytton Oak Road to the south and onto the Strategic Road Network. The site can provide a suitable access into SHR177 from Mytton Oak Road. Development in this location offers the opportunity to deliver the objectives of the Big Town Plan, in particular the potential to develop green infrastructure between this site and land south of Mytton Oak road. There are no overriding site constraints identified. Whilst a small portion of the site is in Flood Zone 2 it is considered this can be mitigated due to the scale of the site. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | There are no overriding infrastructure constraints identified as part of this assessment. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Part of site - preferred residential allocation |
| Reasoning | <p>The site represents a major opportunity for greenfield release on the edge of Shrewsbury between the existing built form (Gains Park) and the A5, consisting of around 25ha. The full extent of the promoted land consists of over 50ha, but it is not considered all this land is necessary to meet development needs up to 2036. The site is well contained to the west (A5), east (Gains park) and south (Mytton oak Road). The site has good potential for access onto Gains Park Way which connects with the Welshpool Road to the north and the Mytton Oak Road to the south and onto the Strategic Road Network. The site can provide a suitable access into SHR177 from Mytton Oak Road. Development in this location offers the opportunity to deliver the objectives of the Big Town Plan, in particular the potential to develop green infrastructure between this site and land south of Mytton Oak road. There are no overriding site constraints identified. Whilst a small portion of the site is in Flood Zone 2 it is considered this can be mitigated due to the scale of the site.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | SHR057 (part) / SHR177 combined capacity of 400 dwellings |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>Development to come forward as part of a comprehensive scheme to enable the delivery of sustainable residential development.</p> <p>Vehicular access will be from Mytton Oak Road.</p> <p>Development will be expected to reflect the key objectives of the Big Town Plan.</p> <p>Development will be expected to contribute to the delivery of enhancements to green infrastructure and wherever possible create green linkages with other existing and planned development sites in the west of the town.</p> <p>Green infrastructure to be planned to link into future planned green network to land south of Mytton Oak Road (proposed allocation SHR158/060/161).</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR060 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>The sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. Together they would need to provide an new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. Large pool to the east is core / priority habitat. A small pond is present 112m from the north west boundary. Another large pond has been created as part of other development 87m east from the north east side. The grassland may also be core / priority habitat. There are a large number of mature trees within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | The grassland would require survey between May and August by a very experienced botanist as pastures are difficult to assess. The on-site and nearby ponds will require assessment. The onsite pond would require a good buffer in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to north and east in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The entire area beyond this development should be master-planned - in part to ensure that adequate greenspace provision is provided for people and wildlife. The main pool here could be enhanced in many ways and a large buffer should be the part of any plans. The environmental network along the northern boundary should be enhanced to link existing corridor. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | BS 5837: 2012 Arboricultural impact assessment must be undertaken and the tree constraints and opportunities used to inform site layout design. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to south is a noise source. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road to avoid noise issues |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site represents part of a major opportunity for significant greenfield land release to the west of the town, within the A5. The site is currently predominantly used for grazing. In following good master planning principles it is considered this site should be considered alongside adjoining sites SHR161 and SHR060. Whilst these sites are being promoted separately, it is understood there is good opportunity to deliver a comprehensively planned development. The site offers the opportunity to extend the green networks in the west of the town - a key objective of the Big Town Plan. The site is considered to meet strategic needs well. The site has no overarching constraints. The sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road and would need to provide a new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. It has a medium/low landscape sensitivity, is considered to be a good location for development by the majority of other service area - ecology, public protection, trees. Heritage have identified the site as an acceptable location, whilst acknowledging the Grade II listed building on the site. It is considered this can be managed through the proposed masterplan process. Whilst the site scores poorly against the SA, it should be recognised that this is predominantly due to the proximity to services and the presences of the Grade II listed Farmhouse at Upper Edgebold, both of which can be mitigated through the masterplan process. The site is over 1.5km to the nearest primary school and convenience store. Frequent bus services operate along Mytton Oak Road and Hanwood Road but these are around 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Preferred mixed use allocation |
| Reasoning | <p>The site represents part of a major opportunity for significant greenfield land release to the west of the town, within the A5. The site is currently predominantly used for grazing. In following good master planning principles it is considered this site should be considered alongside adjoining sites SHR161 and SHR158. These sites are being promoted jointly and it is understood this is underpinned by a land promotion agreement. This will ensure the site is developed in a comprehensive manner, through a master planned approach. The site offers the opportunity to extend the green networks in the west of the town - a key objective of the Big Town Plan. The site is considered to meet strategic needs well. The site has no overarching constraints. The sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road and would need to provide a new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. It has a medium/low landscape sensitivity, is considered to be a good location for development by the majority of other service area - ecology, public protection, trees. Heritage have identified the site as an acceptable location, whilst acknowledging the Grade II listed building on the site. It is considered this can be managed through the proposed masterplan process. Whilst the site scores poorly against the SA, it should be recognised that this is predominantly due to the proximity to services and the presences of the Grade II listed Farmhouse at Upper Edgebold, both of which can be mitigated through the masterplan process. Given the proximity of services it would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. It is recognised there is potential for new education provision within the existing allocated site to the east which could also serve this site. The mix of uses on the site has evolved since the Preferred options consultation in November 2018, reflecting early urban design work being carried out by the site promoter, alongside the consideration of opportunities for park and ride provision and a more focussed and consolidated employment provision.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | SHR158/SHR060/SHR161 combined capacity of 1,500 dwellings, 5ha of employment uses, green spaces, community uses and other on-site infrastructure. |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>This is a significant additional Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) development opportunity for the town. Development will be progressed in a comprehensively planned way, subject to an agreed masterplan reflecting the objectives of the Big Town Plan.</p> <p>This will include a mix of uses, including substantial residential development, commercial land and potentially additional community, leisure and retail uses, where these would not impact on the viability of the town centre.</p> <p>Due to the scale of the site it is likely delivery will continue beyond 2038 into the next plan period.</p> <p>The total site area of land proposed is around 100 hectares. However, to ensure a suitable balance of development it is considered around 50 hectares will be required for residential purposes (to deliver around 1,500 dwellings) and a minimum of 5 hectares will come forward for employment purposes, alongside the potential for new park and ride provision. There are significant opportunities to enhance infrastructure as part of this development.</p> <p>Vehicular access will be served from both Mytton Oak Road and Hanwood Road and will support the creation of a circular link road sufficient to sustain a bus route. Where necessary improvements to the Local and Strategic Road Networks will be funded through the development.</p> <p>Development will support the creation of and enhancements to existing green corridors as part of the Big Town Plan's wider strategy to improve the town's green network. This will also support enhancements to pedestrian and cycle links in this area of town.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR063 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>This site represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. The majority of Nobold Lane (north of Mousecroft Lane) is not fronted by one of these sites so no improvements could be delivered without third party land. Together they would need to provide an new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. This is particular important as there is not direct access to the A5 bypass from Longden Road and there level of development that could be accommodated by the Longden Road route going north east to Roman Road will be limited by existing highway capacity.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. Two large ponds onsite, a large pond in the garden to the west and others nearby would require GCN surveys. Grassland may be of interest. The combination of pools, scrub and hedgerows forms interesting environmental network habitat.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | The grassland would require survey between May and August by a very experienced botanist as pastures are difficult to assess. The on-site and nearby ponds will require assessment. The onsite ponds would require a good buffer in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network on site and to south in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. The field to the east has far fewer lower ecological interest. Leaving the field to the west may work. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Work to enhance the western field would provide good greenspace for any development in the field to the east. Tree planning along the southern boundary would boost the environmental network. Or just letting the hedge grow wide. Another pool could be dug in the western pool. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site includes 19th century brickyard (HER PRN 28270) and small, non-designated field barn |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA and Level 2 historic building assessment of field barn). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | BS 5837: 2012 Arboricultural impact assessment must be undertaken and the tree constraints and opportunities used to inform site layout design. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Potential contaminated land due to past land uses. Road is a noise source to the north of the site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Con land remediation likely to be available. Noise can be mitigated via stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site has potential to be part of a large strategic allocation. Improvements to local highway network required and impact on Strategic road network will need to be assessed. Promoted land to the south of Hanwood Road up to Longden Road offers the opportunity to consider a strategic comprehensive proposal in this direction, although it is acknowledged there are a number of different landowners and there is no known promotion agreement. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Whilst the site has potential to be part of a frontage into a much larger strategic allocation between the Hanwood Road and Longden Road, it is considered there is no requirement to release this land at this time in order to meet the proposed development needs of the town up to 2036. Land to the north between Hanwood Road and Mytton Oak road is preferred for a major expansion of the town in order to meet a significant proportion of development needs up to 2036. It is felt the preferred site offers greater potential benefits to the town and can support the objectives of the Big Town Plan and to achieve a comprehensively planned development.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR064 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 1% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Directly onto Shillingston Drive. The site has sufficient frontage to be able to deliver a suitable form of junction. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss (possibly others). A large part of the area appears to be Environmental Network - Core Habitat and/or Corridor. There is not likely to be space on site to mitigate for the loss of the network. The network requires protection in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Most of the many mature trees on this sites are have TPOs. The habitat appears to be overgrown grassland / scrub in one part, overgrown garden in another and woodland to the east. Several protected species could be found here. The most likely include nesting birds, bats and badgers. It may be that not all the site would qualify as Environmental Network. But it is likely that a big proportion would be which leaves little space for mitigation measures |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation may be required if found. The hedgerows and mature trees should be retained. In particular the TPO trees |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | It may still be the former grassland on site retains interest that could be restored. Woodland enhancement may be possible. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Mature Oak trees on site |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retention of mature tree cover |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No significant constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is within the existing development boundary, without any overriding constraints. Care will need to taken to retain trees on site. Windfall opportunity. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p style="text-align: center;">The site is within the existing development boundary and therefore has windfall potential.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR066 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>The site would access the highway directly onto the new route of Pulley Lane with the exception of SHR185 which is promoted with access to the old route of Pully Lane south of Lower Pulley Cottages - this section of old Pulley Lane in not suitable for new development traffic and improvements could not be achieved without third party land. The left only turn onto Hereford road (from new Pully Lane) works for the current users of the new Pulley Lane route as this accommodates Bayston Hill traffic that wants to access Shrewsbury. If these sites were developed those wanting to access the A5 bypass would need to take a detour to the Meole Brace retail park roundabout - this is not ideal.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss (possibly others). Otherwise none |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Mature trees are present on the borders of this site and perhaps within. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. The grassland may be of interest. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Grassland would require survey between May and August but an experienced surveyor as pastures are difficult to assess. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Good existing hedgerows could be enhanced or thickened to create think woodland and ecological network. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site close to projected line of Roman road (HER PRN 00098). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Some significant trees on and adjacent to the boundaries of the site, level of important tree cover may limit developable area. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No significant constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site is on potential line of Roman Road. Small site in its own right, but could come forward with adjoining land to form a strategic location. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site itself is free of many constraints, although heritage assessments would need to be carried out. However, the site is small in its own right, and although adjoining land to east in also being promoted, at this stage there is no certainty as to the delivery of this combined site. In addition, it is considered that significant land release to the west of the town is preferable in order to meet the town's guideline up to 2036.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR080 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 4% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Potentially 33 homes. Access would be onto Oteley Road. An appropriate junction should be able to be accommodated along with appropriate improvements and links to the existing pedestrian and cycle networks. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss (possibly others). None |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. The western boundary is environmental network that requires protection in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Mature trees are bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | A buffer to the network is required. The hedgerows and mature trees should be retained on the borders |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Woodland planting along the western boundary should be encouraged to enhance the environmental network. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Significant prehistoric and Roman activity in area, so site has some archaeological potential |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Important linear group of road frontage Lime trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retention of mature tree cover |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Oteley road is a busy road and a noise source. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Mitigation through stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site forms part of the current Shrewsbury South SUE |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p style="text-align: center;">The site forms part of the existing Shrewsbury South SUE allocated for development in the SAMDev Plan.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR086 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Access onto Mount Pleasant and Lancaster Road. Dual access to the site will minimise impact on highway network. Impact on existing congestion on Mount Pleasant linked to Mount Pleasant / Ditherington Road junction needs to be assessed and mitigated. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere, Hencott Pool and Clarepool Moss (possibly others) and possible recreation impacts in-combination on Hencott Pool. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. Otherwise none |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Mature trees are within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. A Tree Preservation Order is listed for one tree on the north western corner. The thin woodland strips and scrubby area in the south is environmental network that requires protection in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. A pond is present 162m to the north east. The grassland, despite regular mowing, may hold interest. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Pond to NE would need survey for GCN. Other protected species mitigation may be required. Bats and nesting birds are most likely. Survey the grassland between May and August. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | This area is one of the few areas of greenspace in this area. Any provision of greenspace should be publicly available and ideally enhance existing habitats. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Trees to North and West curtilages screen site from existing residential |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retention of mature tree cover |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Potential noise from commercial to the north and east of the site where there is also noise from railway line. Possible contaminated land. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof. Remediation for contaminated land likely to be available |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | Brownfield site, potential windfall opportunity. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is predominantly brownfield and is located within the existing and proposed development boundary for the town. The site has no overarching constraints, although highway impact on Mount Pleasant linked to Mount Pleasant / Ditherington Road junction needs to be assessed. Potential windfall opportunity.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR093 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 12% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Difficult to access the Strategic Road Network as no direct link to A5 from Longden Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss (possibly others). Otherwise none |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EcIA required. The eastern boundary is environmental network on account of the water course. This requires protection in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. A small pond is present on site at the southern end. A new pond appears to be present in the new development to the east (27m away) and another pool 165m to the west. There are several mature trees within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. Water Voles are possible on this water course and otter are likely to use it as corridor. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to east in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. A large buffer to the water course should be provided. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The water course could be enhanced to make a feature and its capacity increased to help address flooding issues. In-line pools should be considered. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Post-medieval coal workings present on site (HERPRN 06776) Site would reduce/remove spatial separation between built edge of town and Nobold, harming its historic character. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Site subject to full archaeological DBA and evaluation in 2014. Further round of evaluation and mitigation would be secured by condition. Design would need to ensure that a distinct spatial separation is maintained with Nobold |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Trees and hedgerows on the boundaries of the site. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Potential for some impacts from commercial to the east however noted there are closer residential properties therefore no likely issues. Possible contamination of land from mining and quarrying operations in the southern part of the site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof. Remediation for contaminated land likely to be available |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site has been subject to a planning appeal against refusal in 2015 with the Inspector dismissing the proposal (SC ref: 14/01983/OUT). It is recognised there are no overarching landscape and visual impact considerations identified as part of the Local Plan Review assessment with the site scoring medium/low. However, there are heritage concerns relating to potential removal of the gap between the existing built form to the east and the historic hamlet of Nobold. On this it is worth noting that this issue of local character was raised in a planning appeal at Inquiry in 2015, with the inspector concluding that Nobold has a distinctive, rural character and its own separate identity and is that these characteristics are worthy of protection. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site represents a strategic gap between the urban form and the historic hamlet of Nobold; its potential erosion would impact adversely on the character of the area. Whilst current site assessment evidence suggests there are no other overarching on-site constraints, it is felt that the preferred site/s offers more strategic benefit to the town in meeting the identified housing need up to 2036.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR099 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 1% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Very High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Potentially 34 homes. Access arrangements onto Woodcote way will need to be carefully assessed due to the close proximity of the A5112 roundabout and the new Redwings development access. Modifications to the roundabout may be required or access could be incorporated into a modified roundabout. Access should be linked with SHR218. The site is approximately 1.0km from the nearest supermarket, 1.5km from the nearest school. Regular bus services operate along Woodcote Way which is adjacent to the site. There is a good pedestrian and cycle network in the vicinity.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Requires EcIA and surveys for GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Hedgerows with connectivity on site |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Net gain for biodiversity - retain existing features and join green corridors |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from Telford Way Road. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise assessment required to consider impact on road noise to meet internal standards with windows open. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | |
| Strategic Considerations: | Generally, vehicular and wider sustainable access links are considered good. Site has medium to high landscape sensitivity. Currently outside the development boundary. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | |
| Potential for Windfall? | no |
| Potential for Allocation? | no |
| Recommendation | don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>It is considered there are more sustainable options in the town to deliver planned growth over the plan period. The site is considered to have a relatively high sensitivity to landscape change.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR109 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>The current levels of traffic on Ellesmere Road and on the A49 bypass north of Sundorne Road roundabout constrain major development in the north of Shrewsbury and these sites should only be brought forward once the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been secured. The scheme provide alternative routes for existing traffic which reduce the current pressures on Ellesmere Road and the A49 bypass creating additional capacity for major development in north Shrewsbury. The new road will also provide a strategic access route through these sites.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). HRA will be required for impacts on Hencott Pool Ramsar Site part of which is within the area indicated. Impacts include recreational impacts in-combination and direct run-off into site. Part of the area is also in the catchment of Hencott Pool. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) may be required to address potential impact identified in the HRA. These issues would greatly reduce the amount of development possible and would need additional detailed research to inform the HRA of the LPR and at planning application stage. Suggest do not allocate this site. Planned route of the NWRR passes through the middle of this site. Lies in 'rural' setting.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>3 ponds are present within 50m of the site. There are a few damp hollows / pools on site. These and others further away may support GCN. Tree Preservation Orders are listed for several trees and area TPOs both within the sites and on the boundaries. Mature trees are within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Much of the northern area is likely to be too close to the Ramsar site and not possible to develop. The HRA will have to assess whether the rest is possible. For other considerations; protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to north and west in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Much of the land surrounding Hencott pool has been farmed as arable and likely to be overly fertile. Soil stripping and pool creation to the north of the site could result in very species-rich habitat being created with the possibility of species migrating from Hencott Pool |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site detached from built edge of town. Site includes an a possible prehistoric cropmark enclosure (HER PRN 04415). Very large size suggests there may also be wider archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Future proposals for a north west relief road would run through this land making it undesirable to develop if this removes the potential for such a road in future. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Rail noise to the west. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for rail noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | Site considered unacceptable on the basis it removes future potential for NWRR. Without this constraint this is a good site. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | This is a significant site dependent upon the delivery of the proposed NWRR. Other major concerns over the ecological impacts on Hencott Pool Ramsar Site, and the noise impact from the rail line. The site is over 1.0km to the nearest primary school and 1.5km to the nearest convenience store. Frequent bus service operate along Mount Pleasant Road approximately 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. A master plan for these sites would need to include new facilities such as a school and local centre (to be delivered alongside adjoining site options). |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>In time this site may have some potential alongside the delivery of the proposed NWRR. However, ahead of this a sustainable access is not considered achievable and there are other ecological and noise impacts which make this site unsustainable.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR120 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Access onto Whitchurch Road at a signal controlled T-junction should continue to be via the roundabout the site currently shares with Morrisons supermarket. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere, Hencott Pool and Clarepool Moss (possibly others) and possible recreation impacts in-combination on Hencott Pool. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA.. Otherwise none |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required as potential for bats and nesting birds in the buildings. Potential for reptiles alongside the railway line. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species mitigation and enhancement if required. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The Environmental Network along the railway line could be improved. Much more permeable surfaces should be provided. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Includes historic Sentinel Works buildings (HER PRN 06782) |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (Level 2 historic buildings assessment of historic sentinel works buildings). Seek to retain historic works buildings on Battlefield road frontage. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site is brownfield and devoid of trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from road to east - area designated a noise action zone therefore significant noise mitigation likely to be necessary. Potential for noise from Morrisons supermarket, car park and petrol filling station to the south. Contaminated land a potential from existing and past land use on site and |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Suggest standoff from main road is the best option to reduce impacts and ensure no air quality issues are raised. Remediation for contaminated land likely to be available |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | Residential to north may get a betterment in noise environment by removal of commercial that currently exists. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | Brownfield site within the current and emerging Development Boundary. Site within a Source Protection Zone. Potential need for increased open space requirements to mitigate the possible recreation impact on Hencott Pool. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p style="text-align: center;"> The brownfield site has no identified overarching constraints and is located within the defined development boundary. Considered to offer a good opportunity to respond to the objectives of the Big Town plan by virtue of its edge of centre location. Potential windfall opportunity. </p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR127 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Access would be directly onto Monkmoor Road via a new estate road access. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required as potential for bats and nesting birds in the buildings. Mature trees border this site to the south west. The trees may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow, present along part of the south east border is Core / Priority Habitat. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species mitigation and enhancement if required. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retain and widen the border of trees to the SW. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Site includes WWI aircraft hangars from former RAF Monkmoor (HER PRN 06783). Planning appeal to demolish and replace with housing refused in 2017 - now seen by Historic England as model case for protecting non-designated heritage assets. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment produced for applications in 2016. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site is brownfield and devoid of trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible land contamination from past and existing commercial operations. Possible noise from commercial to the northeast |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Con land remediation likely to be possible. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | Would remove noise sources from existing commercial activities on existing residential properties providing a betterment. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | The brownfield site is approximately 1.0km from the nearest supermarket, 1.5km from the nearest school. Regular bus services operate along Woodcote Way which is adjacent to the site. There is a good pedestrian and cycle network in the vicinity. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | Whilst the site is brownfield, significant concern has been raised as to the potential impact on the former WW1 aircraft hangers, identified as a non-designated heritage asset. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR139 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 17% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 17% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | This site is with in an existing employment area with a suitable existing access onto Longden Road. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | There are several mature trees bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | The two oak trees on the road side are particularly significant and should have adequate root protection. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The constrained footpath along the south western boundary should be opened up to make this useful link to the railway crossing more amenable. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site is brownfield and devoid of trees, some significant trees adjacent to the site. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible noise from surrounding commercial land. Possible land contamination from past and existing commercial operations |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Con land remediation likely to be possible. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | Sustainable travel to / from these sites will be limited due to the nearest housing being over 1.0km away and a limited bus service operating along Longden Road. There is a continuous footway link into Shrewsbury. Brownfield site and therefore represents potential opportunity to deliver some of the objectives of the Big Town Plan, in particular supporting principle of 'balanced growth'. However, loss of employment will need to be considered. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | The site is an existing employment site with uses on. However, the site may well become available over the plan period and as things stand there are no overarching concerns, although any loss to employment should be weighed in the planning balance. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR142 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>The site would be accessed from Longden Road. It is more strategically beneficial to consider the site alongside the cluster of sites to the north of Longden Road as there is no vehicular access to the A5 from Longden Road and therefore there would be benefits from establishing a spine road between Hanwood Road and Longden Road. However this site could be delivered independently with some local highway improvements.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EcIA required. A water course runs along the north eastern boundary and this - with a buffer - forms part of the Environmental Network. The network requires protection in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. The band of trees alongside the railway line to the east is protected as an area TPO and it also forms part of the network. This should also be adequately buffered. There are a large number of mature trees bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. A pond is present about 85m north of the site however the barriers (like the road) and the poor apparent condition of this pond (very overgrown) would mean GCN are unlikely to be harmed by development at this site (unless other ponds are found).</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Buffers to the water course to the north and TPO trees to the east are required. Hedgerows should be retained and mature boundary trees given a good buffer to protect their roots. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The water course could be enhanced to make a feature and its capacity increased to help address flooding issues. In-line pools should be considered. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site includes an area of former coal workings (HER PRN 06776). Site would potentially remove separation of historic hamlet of Nobold from the built edge of Shrewsbury, resulting in harm to its historic character |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + evaluation). Design would need to ensure that a distinct spatial separation is maintained with Nobold |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Few boundary trees of some significance |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from rail to south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Poor |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is over 2.0km to the nearest primary school and convenience store as third party land would be required to make suitable improvements to the existing PRoW access to Radbrook Green. Frequent bus service operate along Hanwood Road but these are around 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site represents a strategic gap between the urban form and the historic hamlet of Nobold; its potential erosion would impact adversely on the character of the area. Whilst current site assessment evidence suggests there are no other overarching on-site constraints, it is felt that the preferred site/s offers more strategic benefit to the town in meeting the identified housing need up to 2036.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR145 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Potentially 174 homes. Access would be via a new signal controlled junction onto Hereford Road. Direct access to the Meole Brace retail park should be maintained for vehicles as well as pedestrians and cyclists. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | None |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Mature trees border this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. Grassland may be of interest and would require a survey between May and August. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. If the grassland is of interest then the area available may be reduced. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Extend the young woodland on the south west all the way along the western boundary to create ecological network and also help reduce traffic noise / air pollution. Consider soil stripping to create areas of interest. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Number of Bronze Age ring ditches (HER PRNs 00014). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA). NB. Site previously subject to archaeological evaluation and archaeological mitigation would be dealt with by condition. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Field site with curtilage hedges |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible noise from commercial to the north and certainly from road to the west - area designated a noise action zone therefore significant noise mitigation likely to be necessary. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is a greenfield site situated between the Meole Brace Retail Park to the north and the Park and Ride to the south. The site has previously been promoted for an extension to the Retail Park, but is now being promoted for residential purposes. The site is adjacent to the existing development boundary, and therefore offers a good strategic opportunity to develop within the existing urban envelope of the town, promoting cycling and walking given the site is within 500 meters of existing services and regular bus provision and 1km from the nearest primary school. It is not considered necessary to protect any of this area for the expansion of the retail park. Development of the site presents opportunities to improve vehicular access into the Park and Ride through a new signal controlled junction on Hereford Road, although it is preferred that the vehicular/pedestrian/cycle access between the site and the Retail Park is maintained. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | New signal controlled junction on Hereford Road. Maintain existing access point to Retail Park, including vehicular. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Preferred residential allocation |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is a greenfield site situated between the Meole Brace Retail Park to the north and the Park and Ride to the south. The site has previously been promoted for an extension to the Retail Park, but is now being promoted for residential purposes. The site is adjacent to the existing development boundary, and therefore offers a good strategic opportunity to develop within the existing urban envelope of the town, promoting cycling and walking given the site is within 500 meters of existing services and regular bus provision and 1km from the nearest primary school. It is not considered necessary to protect any of this area for the expansion of the retail park. Development of the site presents opportunities to improve vehicular access into the Park and Ride through a new signal controlled junction on Hereford Road, although it is preferred that the vehicular/pedestrian/cycle access between the site and the Retail Park is maintained.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | 150 dwellings |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>Development to provide residential development with the potential for extra care / assisted living facilities. Development to be served by a new access from Hereford Road. Whilst there is a preference to retain an access into the retail park, it is envisaged the current road alignment will be remodelled to avoid 'rat running' and to support an improved road layout. Signal controlled junction on Hereford Road. Maintain vehicular/pedestrian/cycle links to Retail park.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR149 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 12% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 17% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 22% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium and Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium and Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>The site would be accessed from Longden Road. It is more strategically beneficial to consider the site alongside the cluster of sites to the north of Longden Road as there is no vehicular access to the A5 from Longden Road and therefore there would be benefits from establishing a spine road between Hanwood Road and Longden Road. However this site could be delivered independently with some local highway improvements.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Area of core habitat that needs to be retained and perhaps buffered would restrict the area available for development potentially to the point where viability is impacted. There does remain lots of arable land of little biodiversity interest however.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. A significant proportion of the site is made up of wet woodland / swamp which is almost certainly core / priority habitat. It is also likely to support protected species such as GCN, otter, badger, bats, nesting birds and potentially rare plants and invertebrates. Mature trees are in the border of this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Wet woodland block needs to be retained and a significant buffer created the size of which depends on what protected species might be found there. This will impact on the number of dwellings possible on this site which may impact the viability. Hedgerows and boundary trees should be retained. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The wet woodland could be improved for wildlife and potentially for people with a boardwalk through the area created. A full survey would be required first. Woodland planting along the southern boundary would help the network here and also reduce road noise. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site would be detached from existing built edge of town. Site located immediately south of the projected line of a Roman road (HER PRN 00098). No other known archaeological interest but large size of site and proximity to the Roman road suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Significant group of trees / area of emerging woodland within the site. Hedgerows on site boundaries. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Significant noise from road to south and rail to east. Potential contaminated land in the area already noted to have been developed in the southeast corner of the site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Poor |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is over 2.0km to the nearest primary school and convenience store as third party land would be required to make suitable improvements to the existing PRoW access to Radbrook Green. Frequent bus service operate along Hanwood Road but these are around 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site in its own right is significantly divorced from the town and there are concerns about how the site would be accessed except through third party land. There are also heritage concerns regarding potential impact on the Roman Road, and noise impacts from the A5 and rail line. The site could form part of a much wider extension to the town when combined with other promoted land between Hanwood Road and Longden Road, but it is not considered this scale of growth is necessary in this plan period. There is also no evidence of joint land promotion.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR157 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | This potential employment site lies beyond the A5 bypass and would access the A488 south west of its roundabout junction with the A5 bypass. A new junction to the west of Two mile Houses would be needed as the existing field access is too close the bypass junction. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>There are 3 ponds on the site and a number of ponds within 500m. Mitigation land required for GCN may impact the area of land available for development</p> <p>The woodland to the southern border and alongside the A5 is Env. Network and would require protection in accordance with MD12 and CS17. The block of trees to the south is TPO'd.</p> <p>Requires botanical survey, ECLA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers (records on the site), reptiles and nesting birds.</p> <p>The ponds, woodland and hedgerows will need to be retained and appropriately buffered.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and ponds. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site would be detached from existing built edge of town. Site crossed by the projected line of a Roman roads (HER PRN 00098). No other known archaeological interest but very large site size suggests and scatter of metal detectorist finds suggests there may be wider archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LB; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with small copse, scattered field trees and hedgerows, area of TPO woodland adjacent to the site, opposite railway line. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from A5. Landfill on site but likely to be inert however as on site may require checks. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Poor |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | This site, which is being promoted for employment, is around 2km away from the nearest significant areas of housing and the route between does not make any provision for walking or attractive for cycling. The A5 bypass would also represent a significant barrier for sustainable modes of transport. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is significantly divorced from the town and from services and facilities. As a potential employment area the site has a medium-high landscape/visual sensitivity rating and it is considered there are more appropriate locations for large scale employment land.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR157VAR |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>This site, as an employment site, is around 2km away from the nearest significant areas of housing and the route between does not make any provision for walking or attractive for cycling. The A5 bypass would also represent a significant barrier for sustainable modes of transport. As a housing site it could accommodate over 1,900 homes but would be over 2km away from the nearest facilities, schools etc. As a mixed site it is unlikely that it could support all the key facilities for sustainable living. This site, as an employment site, is around 2km away from the nearest significant areas of housing and the route between does not make any provision for walking or attractive for cycling. The A5 bypass would also represent a significant barrier for sustainable modes of transport. As a housing site it could accommodate over 1,900 homes but would be over 2km away from the nearest facilities, schools etc. As a mixed site it is unlikely that it could support all the key facilities for sustainable living.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Protection of ponds on the site will reduce the no. of houses possible.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>There are ponds on the site. Retention and protection of the ponds (with appropriate buffers) will reduce the no. of houses possible.</p> <p>There are badger records on the site - if setts are present, this will reduce the developable area available or a licence will be required to close the sett/s.</p> <p>The woodland to the southern border and alongside the A5 is Env. Network. Requires botanical survey, EclIA and surveys for GCNs (ponds within 500m), bats, badgers, reptiles and nesting birds Hedgerows, trees and ponds will need to be buffered.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site would be detached from existing built edge of town. Cropmark enclosure (HER PRN 00005) of likely prehistoric date present in western part of site and it is also crossed by the projected line of a Roman roads (HER PRN 00098). Very large site size suggests and scatter of metal detectorist finds suggests there may be wider archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LB; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Hedgerows and mature hedgerow trees, scattered mature field trees and areas of woodland around pond and adjacent to railway line and highway. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | tree planting across the site, increase area of woodland along railway line and link to woodland around pond. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from A5. Landfill on site but likely to be inert however as on site may require checks. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Poor |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | This site, which is being promoted for employment, is around 2km away from the nearest significant areas of housing and the route between does not make any provision for walking or attractive for cycling. The A5 bypass would also represent a significant barrier for sustainable modes of transport. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is significantly divorced from the town and from services and facilities. As a potential employment area the site has a medium-high landscape/visual sensitivity rating and it is considered there are more appropriate locations for large scale employment land. It is considered there are more sustainable locations to accommodate employment growth in the town during the plan period.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR158 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 4% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. Together they would need to provide an new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. To check all ponds on site (only one obvious pond but others may be present) for full range of protected species in addition to mature trees, buildings, badger setts, hedgerows and the water course. Pasture in northern fields may be species rich grassland that would be Core / priority or corridor habitat. Environmental Corridor buffers a long ditch that runs through this area. GCN have been recorded in the area including a pond 66m away from the north eastern field (to the west of this field). There are a large number of mature trees within and bordering this site. One is protected by a TPO. Otters are known likely to use the ditch as a corridor and a number of otter deaths have been recorded on the A5 bypass as a result of insufficiently large culverts under the road. Two semi-natural areas at the northern ends of the two north east fields should be surveyed.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network that crosses the site in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. In particular the ditch should be fully buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The entire area beyond this development should be master-planned - in part to ensure that adequate greenspace provision is provided for people and wildlife. The ditch could be re-naturalized and it's capacity increased with in-line pools to made a feature for people and wildlife. De-culvert this where possible. Enhancement of the two semi-natural areas at the northern ends of the two north east fields. Save passage for otters under or over the A5 should be installed or a means of preventing them from crossing the road. This could also provide a better crossing for people. A green bridge. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site includes, and has the potential to effect the setting of, Grade II listed Upper Edgebold farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1055682). Also includes the associated historic farmstead (HER PRN 40903) and medieval moated site (HER PRN 02968). No other known archaeological interest but very large site size suggests there may be wider archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of LB; Level 2 historic buildings assessment if any demo proposed at Upper Edgebold Farm; DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from road to the west and south. Existing farm on site which if it remains may cause concerns (noise, odour, dusts) and of this area were to be developed may have contaminated land due to past activity. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Con land remediation likely to be available. Should the farm remain I would suggest that good stand off distance to first residential properties is proposed to ensure the business does not get hampered by development and vice versa. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site represents a major opportunity for significant greenfield land release to the west of the town, within the A5. The site is currently predominantly used for grazing. In following good master planning principles it is considered this site should be considered alongside adjoining sites SHR161 and SHR060. Whilst these sites are being promoted separately, it is understood there is good opportunity to deliver a comprehensively planned development. The site offers the opportunity to extend the green networks in the west of the town - a key objective of the Big Town Plan. The site has no overarching constraints identified. The sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road and would need to provide an new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. It has a medium/low landscape sensitivity, is considered to be a good location for development by the majority of other service area - ecology, public protection, trees. Heritage have identified the site as an acceptable location, whilst acknowledging the Grade II listed building on the site. It is considered this can be managed through the proposed masterplan process. Whilst the site scores poorly against the SA, it should be recognised that this is predominantly due to the proximity to services and the presences of the Grade II listed Farmhouse at Upper Edgebold, both of which can be mitigated through the masterplan process. These sites (158, 060, 161) are over 1.5km to the nearest primary school and convenience store. Frequent bus service operate along Mytton Oak Road and Hanwood Road but these are around 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | The site's scale offers significant opportunity to develop additional services and facilities and to mitigate out identified constraints. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Preferred mixed use allocation |
| Reasoning | <p>he site represents part of a major opportunity for significant greenfield land release to the west of the town, within the A5. The site is currently predominantly used for grazing. In following good master planning principles it is considered this site should be considered alongside adjoining sites SHR161 and SHR158. These sites are being promoted jointly and it is understood this is underpinned by a land promotion agreement. This will ensure the site is developed in a comprehensive manner, through a master planned approach. The site offers the opportunity to extend the green networks in the west of the town - a key objective of the Big Town Plan. The site is considered to meet strategic needs well. The site has no overarching constraints. The sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road and would need to provide a new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. It has a medium/low landscape sensitivity, is considered to be a good location for development by the majority of other service area - ecology, public protection, trees. Heritage have identified the site as an acceptable location, whilst acknowledging the Grade II listed building on the site. It is considered this can be managed through the proposed masterplan process. Whilst the site scores poorly against the SA, it should be recognised that this is predominantly due to the proximity to services and the presences of the Grade II listed Farmhouse at Upper Edgebold, both of which can be mitigated through the masterplan process. Given the proximity of services it would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. It is recognised there is potential for new education provision within the existing allocated site to the east which could also serve this site. The mix of uses on the site has evolved since the Preferred options consultation in November 2018, reflecting early urban design work being carried out by the site promoter, alongside the consideration of opportunities for park and ride provision and a more focussed and consolidated employment provision.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | SSHR158/SHR060/SHR161 combined capacity of 1,500 dwellings, 5ha of employment uses, green spaces, community uses and other on-site infrastructure. |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>This is a significant additional Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) development opportunity for the town. Development will be progressed in a comprehensively planned way, subject to an agreed masterplan reflecting the objectives of the Big Town Plan.</p> <p>This will include a mix of uses, including substantial residential development, commercial land and potentially additional community, leisure and retail uses, where these would not impact on the viability of the town centre.</p> <p>Due to the scale of the site it is likely delivery will continue beyond 2038 into the next plan period.</p> <p>The total site area of land proposed is around 100 hectares. However, to ensure a suitable balance of development it is considered around 50 hectares will be required for residential purposes (to deliver around 1,500 dwellings) and a minimum of 5 hectares will come forward for employment purposes, alongside the potential for new park and ride provision. There are significant opportunities to enhance infrastructure as part of this development.</p> <p>Vehicular access will be served from both Mytton Oak Road and Hanwood Road and will support the creation of a circular link road sufficient to sustain a bus route. Where necessary improvements to the Local and Strategic Road Networks will be funded through the development.</p> <p>Development will support the creation of and enhancements to existing green corridors as part of the Big Town Plan's wider strategy to improve the town's green network. This will also support enhancements to pedestrian and cycle links in this area of town.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR160 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 7% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>This site is part of a group of sites to the north of A49/A53 Battlefield Roundabout in a location where the local highway network is close to capacity at peak times. Specifically the development would add to the existing congestion on the A49 bypass between the A53 and Sundorne Road. It is unlikely that the congestion can be mitigated. Development of this scale in the location is unlikely to be acceptable in highways terms until the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been completed.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Woodland to the north is Plantation Ancient Woodland and would need to be buffered from the effects of development under NPPF and MD12 (15 - 50m) reducing area available for development. Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>GCN have been recorded in the pond in the garden to the south. Boundary trees may support bats and birds and should be assessed. The hedgerows are core / priority habitat and should be retained. The thin woodland on the northern boundary is protected under an area TPO.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Some land may be required near this pool for mitigation. A large buffer would be required along the northern boundary to protect the TPO trees. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Woodland planting along the north and east boundaries should be encouraged to enhance the environmental network. A pond should be created near the southern boundary. SUDS features should be suitable for GCN. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Potential effect on setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033). Possible archaeological interest relating to the battle archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Scattered mature curtilage trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible noise to the west from road. Small landfill to north, commercial to the north as a noise and dust source. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Con land remediation likely to be available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Poor |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is divorced from the settlement and should only come forward if SHR195 is preferred. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | The site is divorced from the settlement and site SHR195 is not preferred. There are also outstanding concerns relating the impact to the on-site dense woodland to the north of the site. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR161 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 13% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 18% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. Together they would need to provide a new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. At least one pond is present on site. Two ponds found within 50m of the site are known to have GCN. Mitigation land required for GCN may impact the area of land available for development - in particular if GCN are found on site. There are a large number of mature trees within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Tree Preservation Orders are listed for several trees on site and in the boundary - mostly the eastern side. The created landscape may have already developed biodiversity interest. Some species of interest have been found in the SUDS feature near the entrance.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. This is likely to involve setting aside terrestrial habitat near the pond in the garden to the north of the site. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field with large buffers for the TPO trees in particular. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network that runs down the eastern side in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. This would also take into consideration the TPO trees. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Environmental Network could be enhanced in many places. In particular the eastern side. The side would serve well as a country park given the infrastructure has already been installed. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Archaeological features identified through archaeological work in 2012 -13. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Archaeological mitigation can be secured by condition. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows, some TPO trees on and adjacent to the site. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No notable constraints |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site represents part of a major opportunity for significant greenfield land release to the west of the town, within the A5. The site is currently predominantly used for grazing. In following good master planning principles it is considered this site should be considered alongside adjoining sites SHR161 and SHR060. Whilst these sites are being promoted separately, it is understood there is good opportunity to deliver a comprehensively planned development. The site offers the opportunity to extend the green networks in the west of the town - a key objective of the Big Town Plan. The site is considered to meet strategic needs well. The site has no overarching constraints. The sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road and would need to provide an new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. It has a medium/low landscape sensitivity, is considered to be a good location for development by the majority of other service area - ecology, public protection, trees. Heritage have identified the site as an acceptable location, whilst acknowledging the Grade II listed building on the site. It is considered this can be managed through the proposed masterplan process. Whilst the site scores poorly against the SA, it should be recognised that this is predominantly due to the proximity to services and the presences of the Grade II listed Farmhouse at Upper Edgebold, both of which can be mitigated through the masterplan process. These sites are over 1.5km to the nearest primary school and convenience store. Frequent bus service operate along Mytton Oak Road and Hanwood Road but these are around 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Preferred mixed use allocation |
| Reasoning | <p>he site represents part of a major opportunity for significant greenfield land release to the west of the town, within the A5. The site is currently predominantly used for grazing. In following good master planning principles it is considered this site should be considered alongside adjoining sites SHR161 and SHR158. These sites are being promoted jointly and it is understood this is underpinned by a land promotion agreement. This will ensure the site is developed in a comprehensive manner, through a master planned approach. The site offers the opportunity to extend the green networks in the west of the town - a key objective of the Big Town Plan. The site is considered to meet strategic needs well. The site has no overarching constraints. The sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road and would need to provide a new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. It has a medium/low landscape sensitivity, is considered to be a good location for development by the majority of other service area - ecology, public protection, trees. Heritage have identified the site as an acceptable location, whilst acknowledging the Grade II listed building on the site. It is considered this can be managed through the proposed masterplan process. Whilst the site scores poorly against the SA, it should be recognised that this is predominantly due to the proximity to services and the presences of the Grade II listed Farmhouse at Upper Edgebold, both of which can be mitigated through the masterplan process. Given the proximity of services it would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. It is recognised there is potential for new education provision within the existing allocated site to the east which could also serve this site. The mix of uses on the site has evolved since the Preferred options consultation in November 2018, reflecting early urban design work being carried out by the site promoter, alongside the consideration of opportunities for park and ride provision and a more focussed and consolidated employment provision.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | SHR158/SHR060/SHR161 combined capacity of 1,500 dwellings, 5ha of employment uses, green spaces, community uses and other on-site infrastructure. |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>This is a significant additional Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) development opportunity for the town. Development will be progressed in a comprehensively planned way, subject to an agreed masterplan reflecting the objectives of the Big Town Plan.</p> <p>This will include a mix of uses, including substantial residential development, commercial land and potentially additional community, leisure and retail uses, where these would not impact on the viability of the town centre.</p> <p>Due to the scale of the site it is likely delivery will continue beyond 2038 into the next plan period.</p> <p>The total site area of land proposed is around 100 hectares. However, to ensure a suitable balance of development it is considered around 50 hectares will be required for residential purposes (to deliver around 1,500 dwellings) and a minimum of 5 hectares will come forward for employment purposes, alongside the potential for new park and ride provision. There are significant opportunities to enhance infrastructure as part of this development.</p> <p>Vehicular access will be served from both Mytton Oak Road and Hanwood Road and will support the creation of a circular link road sufficient to sustain a bus route. Where necessary improvements to the Local and Strategic Road Networks will be funded through the development.</p> <p>Development will support the creation of and enhancements to existing green corridors as part of the Big Town Plan's wider strategy to improve the town's green network. This will also support enhancements to pedestrian and cycle links in this area of town.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR162 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low and Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low and High |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium and High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium and High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | SHR162 is part of SHR216 which has the potential to deliver 694 homes. Access would be onto Holy Head Road. Land would need to be protected to deliver the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road across the southern part of the site. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. A large garden pond is found 40m to the west of this area. Shelton Rough Local Wildlife Site is directly adjacent to the eastern boundary and northern corner. The grassland may be species rich and could be defined as Core / Priority Habitat and therefore be considered in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. There are a large number of mature trees within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. A block of woodland to the north west is at least Corridor Habitat and likely Core Habitat. Several protected species are likely to be found on or near the site including birds, bats, badgers |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement - in particular if the pond is found to support breeding GCN. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network borders the site on most sides in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. In particular a wider buffer should be in place adjacent to the Local Wildlife Site woodland. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The woodland to the east and the block to the west could be enhanced by further tree planting adjacent to it. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Significant trees and woodlands on the boundaries of the site, level of important tree cover may limit developable area. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | See assessment for SHR216 |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | N/A |
| Potential for Allocation? | N/A |
| Recommendation | N/A |
| Reasoning | <p style="text-align: center;">See site assessment for SHR216</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR163 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites have the potential to deliver 4,958 homes. The current levels of traffic on Ellesmere Road and on the A49 bypass north of Sundorne Road roundabout constrain major development in the north of Shrewsbury and these sites should only be brought forward once the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been secured. The scheme provide alternative routes for existing traffic which reduce the current pressures on Ellesmere Road and the A49 bypass creating additional capacity for major development in north Shrewsbury. The new road will also provide a strategic access route through these sites.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). HRA will also be required for other impacts on Hencott Pool Ramsar Site part of which is directly adjacent and within the surface water catchment. Issues include recreational impacts in-combination and direct run-off into site. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) may be required to address potential recreational impacts identified in the HRA. These issues would greatly reduce the amount of development possible and would need additional detailed research to inform the HRA of the LPR and at planning application stage. Suggest do not allocate this site. Planned route of the NWRR passes through the middle of this site. Lies in 'rural' setting.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>One pond is found in this area and 2 ponds are present within 50m. These and others further away may support GCN. The outflow from Hencott Pool flows through this area. Mature trees are within and bordering this site - most of which are protected under TPOs. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. Much of the area is arable with little biodiversity interest.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Much of the northern area is likely to be too close to the Ramsar site and not possible to develop. The HRA will have to assess whether the rest is possible. For other considerations; protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to north and through the site in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Much of the land surrounding Hencott pool has been farmed as arable and likely to be overly fertile. Soil stripping and pool creation to the north of the site could result in very species-rich habitat being created with the possibility of species migrating from Hencott Pool. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with curtilage hedges borders woodland to the NW |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | NWRR location likely to run through the site. Road on southeast boundary a noise source. Poss. con land from unknown filled ground to the northwest. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Con land remediation likely to be available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | Consideration of any future NWRR should be given. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | This is a significant site dependent upon the delivery of the proposed NWRR. Other major concerns over the ecological impacts on Hencott Pool Ramsar Site, and the noise impact from the rail line. The site is over 1.0km to the nearest primary school and 1.5km to the nearest convenience store. Frequent bus service operate along Mount Pleasant Road approximately 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. A master plan for these sites would need to include new facilities such as a school and local centre (to be delivered alongside adjoining site options). |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | In time this site may have some potential alongside the delivery of the proposed NWRR. However, ahead of this a sustainable access is not considered achievable and there are other ecological and noise impacts which make this site unsustainable. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR165 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 53% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 61% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 39% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Access would be via a new junction onto Hazeldine Way. An appropriate standard junction with links to the existing pedestrian and cycle network is achievable but space is constrained by land levels and crash barrier to bridge over Rea Brook.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>2 large new ponds are present within 40m and 60m. These and others further away may support GCN. Part of the site already appears to be developed in part. There is a block of new woodland to the north west. Hedgerow, that forms some of the boundaries, is Core / Priority Habitat.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement - in particular if the ponds are found to support breeding GCN. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Further woodland planting at the north west corner plus some network creation along the eastern boundary would be useful. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Field site is surrounded with mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Low density with retention of mature trees |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Rail and road noise to site boundaries. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | 61% of site in flood zones 2 and 3 which will reduce the potential numbers of dwellings. Within the existing development boundary. The site is approximately 500m from the nearest supermarket and regular bus service and less than 1.5km from the nearest primary school. There is a good pedestrian and cycle network in the vicinity. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is a greenfield location within the development boundary capable of safe access. However, flood risk is a major constraint which could undermine viability as the scale of delivery will need to be significantly reduced.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR166 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 93% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | This employment site has direct access onto the A49 bypass and appropriate junction(s) could be achieved along the site frontage. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | North west and south west corners of this area are within the Environmental Network due to the proximity to the flood plain. These parts are in flood zone two and three. Requires EclA and surveys for bats (transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12 |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | A useful habitat corridor could be created to the west and also along the line of the power cables. See accompanying document. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site may effect settings of Scheduled Monuments of Haughmond Hill hillfort (NHLE ref. 1021282) and Queen Eleanor's Bower ringwork (NHLE ref. 1021281). Site contains majority of large Roman marching camp (HER PRN 00124) so has significant archaeological potential. Site detached from existing built edge of Shrewsbury |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of SMS; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). NB Part of Roman marching camp excavated in advance of construction of A49 bypass. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Treeless field site - would need buffer zone to the river and screening to the A49 |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retain existing trees and Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from A49 and rail. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is well contained between the A49 to the east, the River Severn to the west and north, and the railway line to the south. Highway access can be achieved from the A49. The scale of the site allows for the opportunity for a self contained employment site appropriate for a range of class B uses north of the strategic A49/A5 junction. The prospects of sustainable travel to / from this location are extremely limited unless a new cycle / footbridge could be constructed across the river Severn to Crowmere Road. There are no footways along the existing bypass routes from housing in Sundorne to the north or London Road to the south, both of which are over 2km away. Therefore not suited to residential use. The site is physically separated from the existing built form of the town and therefore is not considered to offer opportunities for mixed use. It is recognised the site has been identified as having high landscape and visual sensitivity, however, this is in relation to the larger land use parcel also covers land to the east of the A49 into an area of less self containment. The site is currently identified as having potential for a Parkway Station in the adopted Core Strategy |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | 7% of the site is in Flood risk zone 2 and 3 and therefore must be mitigated through the design and layout of the any future proposal. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Access from the A49 offers the potential to attract investment. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Preferred Employment Allocation |
| Reasoning | The site is well contained but divorced from the existing residential built form of the town, and therefore not considered appropriate for housing development. However, the site's strategic access point from the A49 offers a good opportunity to develop a strategically important employment location. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | 45ha of employment land |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | This site offers the opportunity for a significant new employment area to the east of the town. Access is proposed from the A49, which also provides a defined boundary to the site. It is envisaged this site could be development for a wide range of employment uses including B1, B2 and B8. A small proportion of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and/or 3 and this will need to be considered in the layout and design of development. |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR168 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium and High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low and Medium-High |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Very High and Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High and Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Access would be onto Corporation Lane some 200m north of the Nursery Meadows junctions. This section of Corporation Lane is a single track lane with no pedestrian facilities and unsuitable for the traffic associated with the proposed development. Third party land would be required to improve the lane. Also the access route onto the Berwick Road (Corporation Lane and Coton Crescent) are narrow residential streets.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others.) and for possible recreation impacts in-combination on Hencott Pool. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. Entire area may be Environmental Network - Core Habitat and/or Corridor. There is no space on site to mitigate for the loss of the network. The network requires protection in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>The grassland habitat has been identified as potentially of interest and if so this would mean the entire site is core habitat in the environmental network and requires protection in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. There is a large pool just over the railway line which has recently been shown to support a medium population of Great Crested Newts. If the grassland isn't of interest then much of the boundary of the site is corridor in the Env. Network. Mature trees border this site. One mature tree is protected with a TPO. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Survey may reveal that not all the site is Environmental Network but where this is present it should be protected, enhanced and restored in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Area of mitigation required is likely to reduce the area available for development. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Corridor to the east and west could be enhanced |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Curtilage trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Rail to east as noise source. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Around 10% of the site is brownfield. The site is over 1.0km to the nearest shops and primary school on Ellesmere Road. The route would be via Corporation Lane which has no footways albeit lightly trafficked. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't Allocate |
| Reasoning | <p style="text-align: center;">The site's access is not considered suitable, and there are more sustainable options elsewhere.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR169 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 34% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 66% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 33% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Very High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Access via a new priority junction onto Berwick Road which is subject to the national speed limit. Would only be appropriate if it could be demonstrated that the existing 40mph speed limit could be appropriately extended. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Mature trees are within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. A Tree Preservation Order is listed for the block of trees to the north. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries and infield. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Enhance Environmental Network by additional tree planting. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Scattered mature curtilage trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retain existing trees |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to south of the site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is over 1.5km to the nearest shops and primary school on Ellesmere Road. Third of site in Flood Zone 2 and within the Environmental Network. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't Allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>A third of the site is within Flood Zone 2, and within the Environmental Network, and therefore there is concern the site is not viable for development. More preferred sites elsewhere.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR170 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 98% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Access would be via Shelton Lane to Holy Head Road. Shelton Lane is very narrow and not suitable for regular vehicular traffic and would need to be upgraded from bridleway to estate road standards if this development were to go ahead and third party land may be required.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepools Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Entire area is Environmental Network - Core Habitat and/or Corridor. There is no space on site to mitigate for the loss of the network. The network requires protection in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. The site may have once been species-rich grassland but now appears to be a mix of scrub and woodland. Being semi-natural in character the entire site creates good corridor habitat - perhaps Core Habitat in places. Several protected species could use this habitat. In particular, nesting birds, bats, badgers, reptiles, and otter.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Survey may reveal that not all the site is Environmental Network but where this is present it should be protected, enhanced and restored in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | It may still be possible to restore the former species-rich grassland. Woodland enhancement may be possible. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Significant woodland across site, could not be developed without the loss of a significant area of high value woodland. |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible off site contamination migration possible. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Con land remediation available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | This site is around 1.8km from the nearest primary school and 2km from the nearest convenience store. The regular bus services that run along the Holy Head Road are less than 400m from the sites. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't Allocate |
| Reasoning | Suitable vehicular access not achievable. Concern about loss of high quality woodland, and the impact on the environmental network. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR171 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 9% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 90% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 9% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 18% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>his site is isolated from the other sites being promoted between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. It would therefore need to be developed as a stand alone site with access assumed to be via the existing private lane to Ley Grange. The junction of this lane with the Mytton Oak Road would need to be improved. If the lane is to be adopted it would need to be improved to highway estate road standards. Alternatively the site could be accessed via a new roundabout junction replacing the existing Gains Park Way / Mytton Oak Road ghost island right turn junction.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Mitigation land required for GCN may impact the area of land available for development - in particular if GCN are found on site. The area required may impact the viability of any development here. If the grassland is priority / core habitat, then the reduced area available for development after adequate mitigation has been provided may make this site unviable</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. Eastern part of site is in Flood Zone 2 and 3 and also the Environmental Network on account of the buffered area from the Bowbrook. A pond is present and GCN are known from the area. Mitigation land required for GCN may impact the area of land available for development - in particular if GCN are found on site. Another large pond is present to the east which may also support GCN. There are a large number of mature trees within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to south and east in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Buffer to the Bowbrook could provide useful enhancement to this corridor if large enough (at least 10m). In-line pools could also act as a flood mitigation measure. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Significant trees on and adjacent to the site, may limit developable area and access. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to north |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | 10% of site in flood zones 2 and 3. Site is a Source Protection Zone. 18% of site in 1000 years surface water flooding zone. The site can easily be linked into existing pedestrian and cycle infrastructure and there is a frequent bus service on Mytton Oak Road (less than 400m away). It is approximately 1 km from a local shopping centre Oxon Primary School. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't Allocate |
| Reasoning | The site could form part of a wider allocation with other promoted sites between Mytton Oak Road and Hanwood Road, but this would be reliant on additional land being promoted to the east. Other site preferable at this stage to accommodate need. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR173 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 94% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>This is part of a cluster of site options (along with SHR179 and SHR180) SHR173 has the potential to deliver 700 homes. Access would be via a new junction onto Ellesmere Road. The traffic generated by such a large development - as high as 500 trip in the peak hour - would create significant congestion on Ellesmere Road. It is very unlikely that the congestion can be mitigated. Development of this scale on Ellesmere Road is unlikely to be acceptable in highway terms until the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been completed.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere, Hencott Pool and Clarepool Moss(possibly others) and possible recreation impacts on Hencott Pool. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. North western corner is within a Local Wildlife Site (Core Habitat in the Env. Network) and a wide border of the north and west are Env. Network corridor on account of the grassland which may be of interest. The trees in the LWS are also protected under an area TPO. Mature trees are within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. Some areas look a little like dry ponds. These could require checking.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Grassland would require survey between May and August but an experienced surveyor as pastures are difficult to assess. Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to south and east in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Reduced area of development likely due to mitigation land required for Environmental Network. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Environmental Network could be enhanced in many places. In particular the western side along the railway and the northern side next to the Local Wildlife Site. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with curtilage hedges borders woodland to the NW |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to east, rail to west creating noise sources. Possible contamination from off site sources. Any large scale development on this side of town will need to consider the impact on air quality of the future development on the town centre, particularly the AQMA. Any additional vehicles entering town from this direction will impact negatively. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Contaminated land remediation likely to be available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Development of the NWRR would remove the highway objection to this site. If allocated developer contributions should be sought towards the creation of a NWRR. Large site on the edge of Shrewsbury's urban area, within easy walking distance of the town centre and train station and on a public transport. Opportunity for biodiversity gain as part of buffering to the north and east/south-east of the site. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The proposal for the North West Relief Road is central to the inclusion of this site as an allocation. Currently, traffic between areas to the north and west of Shrewsbury has to pass through the town centre, through unsuitable roads west of the town or take the significantly longer route around the A5 / A49 bypass. As a result, there are unacceptably high levels of traffic including heavy vehicles on residential roads, including Ellesmere Road, approaching the town centre and within the centre itself where there is only limited highway capacity. This leads to problems of congestion, delays and journey unreliability for road users, and problems of noise, poor air quality and reduced accessibility, public transport services are also affected by congestion. At the time of the original Preferred Options consultation in November 2018, Shropshire Council did not have agreed funding for this road and it was therefore not considered as a viable opportunity to include within the Local Plan review. In February 2019 it was agreed the Council would receive £54m of funding towards the construction of the NWRR, and Shropshire Council now expects to submit a planning application in August 2020. If approved, the scheme will be completed by the end of 2023. Without the NWRR it is not considered the highways access to SHR173 is achievable without unacceptable impact on existing road network and amenity value of local residents. It is therefore considered the allocation should not come forward until the completion of the NWRR. The scheme has the potential to support funding for the NWRR through community infrastructure levy (CIL) funding. The scheme is considered to be in a sustainable location within a 15/20min walk of the town centre, and can support biodiversity gain through the creation of a green infrastructure buffer to the north of the site, adjacent to the Old River Bed SSSI and to the east/south-east adjacent to the railway line. There are opportunities to deliver local facilities at the scale of housing proposed which increases the self-containment of the proposal and reduces the need to travel. The option represents a complementary area of growth with land to the west of the town. This supports a balanced approach to growth in the town in the long term.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | 450 |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>Dependent upon the delivery of the NWRR, and phasing should reflect this with no occupation before the road's operation.</p> <p>Opportunity to deliver the scheme through a master planned approach, focussing on design quality, layout and mix.</p> <p>Opportunity to support key objectives of the Big Town Plan.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR174 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 94% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 15% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites have the potential to deliver 4,958 homes. The current levels of traffic on Ellesmere Road and on the A49 bypass north of Sundorne Road roundabout constrain major development in the north of Shrewsbury and these sites should only be brought forward once the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been secured. The scheme provide alternative routes for existing traffic which reduce the current pressures on Ellesmere Road and the A49 bypass creating additional capacity for major development in north Shrewsbury. The new road will also provide a strategic access route through these sites.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). HRA will also be required for impacts on Hencott Pool Ramsar Site, which is entirely within this allocation. Clearly the Ramsar will not be possible to build on but it may well be impossible to develop much of the rest of this area. Impacts directly and indirectly on the Ramsar would also include destruction of habitats, recreational impacts in-combination, damage to the water catchment and direct run-off into site. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address potential recreation impacts identified in the HRA. These issues would greatly reduce the amount of development possible and would need additional detailed research to inform the HRA of the LPR and at planning application stage. Suggest do not allocate this site. Planned route of the NWRR passes through the middle of this site. Lies in 'rural' setting. SHR200 is part of this site but there is no entry in this spreadsheet. Similar reservations would apply.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. Surveys for GCN (in ponds adjacent), Reptiles, Badgers (known), Bats (buildings could require survey if being altered / destroyed), nesting birds, vascular plants. Environmental Network, including several areas of core / priority habitat would require survey. TPO trees are throughout.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | The HRA - informed by the EclA - will have to assess how much of this area might be available for development. For other considerations; protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network - mostly to west and north but also through site - in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Much of the land surrounding Hencott pool has been farmed as arable and likely to be overly fertile. Soil stripping and pool creation close to the Ramsar could result in very species-rich habitat being created with the possibility of species migrating from Hencott Pool. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible effect on setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033). Site includes historic farmstead of Cross Hill Farm (HER PRN 26966) and possible prehistoric cropmark enclosure (HER PRN 04241). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield; Level 2 historic buildings assessment; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | This site has 2 important Heavily wooded or plantation of trees on to the NW and Hencott pool Ramsar site |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Remainder of site is agricultural with hedges and scattered trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature woodlands |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Part of site suitable part of site not suitable |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to east creating noise sources. Any large scale development on this side of time will need to consider the impact on air quality of the future development on the town centre, particularly the AQMA. Any additional vehicles entering town from this direction will impact negatively. Poss. contaminated land. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Contaminated land remediation likely to be available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | Would be better site if air quality concerns for town centre were not so pronounced. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | This is a significant site dependent upon the delivery of the proposed NWRR. Other major concerns over the ecological impacts on Hencott Pool Ramsar Site, and the noise impact from the rail line. The site is over 1.0km to the nearest primary school and 1.5km to the nearest convenience store. Frequent bus service operate along Mount Pleasant Road approximately 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. A master plan for these sites would need to include new facilities such as a school and local centre (to be delivered alongside adjoining site options). |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>In time this site may have some potential alongside the delivery of the proposed NWRR. However, ahead of this a sustainable access is not considered achievable and there are other ecological and noise impacts which make this site unsustainable.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR176 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 14% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 16% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 84% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 9% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 15% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Access is proposed onto Preston Street. In the interests of highway safety and to protect the amenity of residents in the vicinity of Preston Street, the new development south this site was given permission based on a 150 occupancy limit (with access onto Preston Street only) before a through route to London Road (south of Shrewsbury College) is in place. This through route has been designed to be attractive for those living in the new development to travel in both direction but is not direct and would not be attractive for those from SHR176 to use to gain access the strategic highway network at the A5 Emstrey Roundabout. Therefore it is unlikely that SHR176 would be acceptable due to the impact on Preston Street.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). A large proportion of this area is Environmental Network - Core Habitat and/or Corridor. Partly because much of it is in flood zones 2 and 3. There is little space on site to mitigate for the loss of the network which may impact the viability of this area as a whole. Fields to the west are arable and outside the network so less likely to have issues.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. A large proportion of this area is Environmental Network - Core Habitat and/or Corridor. Partly because much of it is in flood zones 2 and 3. There is little space on site to mitigate for the loss of the network. The network requires protection in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. The River Severn along the eastern boundary and a buffer to this is also designated as a Local Wildlife Site. To the north a former quarry in the woodland is also protected as a Local Geological Site. Mature trees are within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. Two ponds are found in this area and 2 ponds are present within 210m. These and others further away may support GCN. Otter will use the River corridor but may also shelter in the woodland / scrub near the pond and drain and other areas. Badger are likely. Bats and birds are likely to use the buildings.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries and woodland block. Environmental Network and both Local designated sites should be protected, enhanced and restored in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Area of mitigation required is likely to reduce the area available for development. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The field to the far east should be planted up as a mix of woodland and ephemeral pools. The line of the drain with the pool should be extended on both ends to enhance this corridor and perhaps coupled with an access route. The water course could be enhanced to make a feature and its capacity increased to help address flooding issues. In-line pools and 'leaky dams' should be considered. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site contains non-designated historic farmstead of Weirhill (HER PRNs 15145 & 27842) and site of Preston Ferry (HER PRN 02759). No other known archaeological interest but very large site size suggests there may be wider archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (Level 2 historic building assessment of historic farmstead if demo proposed or setting assessment to provide suitable stand-off from farm ; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Remainder of site is agricultural with hedges and scattered trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Rail to the north creating noise. Possible con land. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Contaminated land remediation likely to be available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site would represent a further phase to the currently allocated and approved scheme south of Preston Street for 600 dwellings. The site could accommodate around 400 dwellings additional dwellings and provide for an extension to the planned open space south of Preston Street. There is potential for the site to contribute additional community facilities to support this and the consented scheme to the south. Road access is a major concern, and, if preferred, development would need to be phased until after the current scheme has been fully built out. This will have an impact on the rate of housing delivery in the early part of the plan period. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't Allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>There are major concerns of vehicular access in advance of the full delivery of the link road between Preston Street and London Road. The necessary phasing of development would mean the site would not commence development for around five years. Considered there are more sustainable options to the west of the town to accommodate major expansion.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR177 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 21% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 23% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 77% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites have good access onto Gains Park Way which connects with the Welshpool Road to the north and the Mytton Oak Road to the south and onto the SRN. SHR177 could deliver 1,545 homes and SHR177 is promoted as a small employment site. Land would be available from the sites to deliver a series of appropriate type junctions and pedestrian and cycle infrastructure that connects to the existing network in the area.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>A water course runs along the northern and eastern boundary. This and a 50m buffer into the site is within the Env. Network. The coarse grassland may be of interest. Mature trees are within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Two trees just north of this area protected under TPO. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. Birds and bats may also use the buildings present on site.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to north and east in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. This is likely to leave very little room for development. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Network could be enhanced alongside the water course in particular but also down west border. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site includes medieval historic farmstead of Oak Farm (HER PRNs 13055 & 27846). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (Level 2 historic buildings assessment if demo at Oak Farm proposed, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Significant trees along east boundary of the site, hedgerows on other boundaries. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Residential; to the north west and opposite Gains Park Way. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Separation distances primarily with good layout and orientation, abatement technologies and boundary treatment or a combination of the above could be employed to reduce any noise, odour and dust impacts on residential properties. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site represents a major opportunity for greenfield release alongside SHR057 on the edge of Shrewsbury between the existing built form (Gains Park) and the A5, consisting of around 25ha. The full extent of this combined site consists of over 50ha, but it is not considered all this land is necessary to meet development needs up to 2036. The site is well contained to the west (A5), east (Gains park) and south (Mytton oak Road). The combined site has good potential for access onto Gains Park Way which connects with the Welshpool Road to the north and the Mytton Oak Road to the south and onto the Strategic Road Network. Development in this location offers the opportunity to deliver the objectives of the Big Town Plan, in particular the potential to develop green infrastructure between this site and land south of Mytton Oak road. There are no overriding site constraints identified. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Preferred residential allocation |
| Reasoning | <p>The site represents a major opportunity for greenfield release alongside SHR057 on the edge of Shrewsbury between the existing built form (Gains Park) and the A5, consisting of around 25ha. The full extent of this combined site consists of over 50ha, but it is not considered all this land is necessary to meet development needs up to 2036. The site is well contained to the west (A5), east (Gains park) and south (Mytton oak Road). The combined site has good potential for access onto Gains Park Way which connects with the Welshpool Road to the north and the Mytton Oak Road to the south and onto the Strategic Road Network. Development in this location offers the opportunity to deliver the objectives of the Big Town Plan, in particular the potential to develop green infrastructure between this site and land south of Mytton Oak road. There are no overriding site constraints identified.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | SHR057 (part) / SHR177 combined capacity of 500 dwellings |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>Development to come forward as part of a comprehensive scheme to enable the delivery of sustainable residential development.</p> <p>Vehicular access will be from Mytton Oak Road.</p> <p>Development will be expected to reflect the key objectives of the Big Town Plan.</p> <p>Development will be expected to contribute to the delivery of enhancements to green infrastructure and wherever possible create green linkages with other existing and planned development sites in the west of the town.</p> <p>Green infrastructure to be planned to link into future planned green network to land south of Mytton Oak Road (proposed allocation SHR158/060/161).</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR178 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Access would be onto Albert Road. Estate road access with associated pedestrian facilities can be achieved within the site frontage. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Mature trees are within and bordering this site. One tree in the south east corner is protected with a TPO. The trees, hedgerows and buildings may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. This area has very low availability of Public Open Space (POS). Loss of this area to housing would represent the loss of potential POS. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | occasional adjacent mature tree |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site is the existing Reman Services Sports and Social Club with approx. 20% is brownfield. Site within the main urban form with opportunities to connect to existing services and facilities. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | don't allocate |
| Reasoning | Part of the site is currently in use. No overarching constraints identified. Windfall opportunity. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR179 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>This is part of a cluster of site options (along with SHR179 and SHR180) SHR173 has the potential to deliver 700 homes. Access would be via a new junction onto Ellesmere Road. The traffic generated by such a large development - as high as 500 trip in the peak hour - would create significant congestion on Ellesmere Road. It is very unlikely that the congestion can be mitigated. Development of this scale on Ellesmere Road is unlikely to be acceptable in highway terms until the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been completed.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others) and possible recreation impacts in-combination on Hencott Pool. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Mature trees are within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. The areas is bordered to the north and west with Env. Network. The small separate field to the south may contain grassland of interest that qualifies as Core/Priority Habitat. Some areas look a little like dry ponds or small areas of interesting habitat. These could require checking.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to south and east in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Build on the existing small blocks of non-arable land to create accessible natural greenspace. Consider soil stripping to help create biodiverse habitat. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with curtilage hedges and 2 "islands" of trees one central one to the south |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Poss. contaminated land. Road noise to the east. Any large scale development on this side of town will need to consider the impact on air quality of the future development on the town centre, particularly the AQMA. Any additional vehicles entering town from this direction will impact negatively. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Con land remediation likely to be available. Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | Would be a better site if no air quality issues in the town centre on this side of town. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Highways access cannot be achieved without unacceptable impact on existing road network. Until the proposed NWRR is proposed this will continue to be a major concern. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | Highways access cannot be achieved without unacceptable impact on existing road network. Until the proposed NWRR is proposed this will continue to a major concern. Concern about general over-development from Ellesmere Road. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR180 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Access via an extended Cedars Drive to Ellesmere Road. Existing simple T-junction onto Ellesmere Road will need to be checked but probably has the capacity to deal with the additional traffic from this development</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. The grassland may be of interest and qualify as Core/Priority Habitat. Mature trees are within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. A pond with a medium size population of GCN is present to the south - but nobody seems to care.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Survey site between May and August to determine grassland interest. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with curtilage hedges |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is approximately 1km to the nearest food store, 800m to the nearest primary school and less than 400m from the nearest bus stop but this is only a 2 hourly bus service. The pedestrian and cycle network in the vicinity is reasonable but there are sections of footway on Ellesmere Road that are narrow. There has been significant growth along Ellesmere Road over the last five years and there is a risk further growth in a short period could lead to the over-development of the area. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>There has been significant growth along Ellesmere Road over the last five years and there is a risk further growth in a short period could lead to the over-development of the area. In addition the developable area of the site is likely to be reduced due to the need to enhance open space requirements beyond the 30sqm policy to mitigate against impacts from recreation pressure, and given the site is within the Environmental Network. other sites present more sustainable opportunities to develop the town.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR181 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 11% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>The current levels of traffic on Ellesmere Road and on the A49 bypass north of Sundorne Road roundabout constrain major development in the north of Shrewsbury and these sites should only be brought forward once the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been secured. The scheme provide alternative routes for existing traffic which reduce the current pressures on Ellesmere Road and the A49 bypass creating additional capacity for major development in north Shrewsbury. The new road will also provide a strategic access route through these sites.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweetmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). HRA will also be required for additional impacts on Hencott Pool Ramsar Site part of which is directly adjacent including recreational impacts in-combination and direct run-off into site. Part of the area is also in the catchment of Hencott Pool. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address potential residential impacts identified in the HRA. These issues would greatly reduce the amount of development possible and would need additional detailed research to inform the HRA of the LPR and at planning application stage. Suggest do not allocate this site. Planned route of the NWRR passes through the middle of this site. Lies in 'rural' setting.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Two ponds are found in this area and 3 ponds are present within 50m. These and others further away may support GCN. Mature trees are within and bordering this site - with some boundary trees to the south protected under TPOs. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. Most of the area is arable farmland with little biodiversity interest. Otter has been recorded in the small copse near the north west.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | South west part of this area is directly adjacent to Hencott Pool Ramsar site. Much of the area is likely to be too close to the Ramsar site for development. The HRA will have to assess whether the rest is possible. For other considerations; protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to north west and adjacent to the Ramsar in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The woodland block with pools to the north west could form the core of public open space. The buffer to Hencott Pool needs to be significant. Much of the land surrounding Hencott pool has been farmed as arable and likely to be overly fertile. Soil stripping and pool creation near the Hencott Pool could result in very species-rich habitat being created with the possibility of species migrating from Hencott Pool. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible effect on setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033). Site includes possible prehistoric cropmark enclosure (HER PRN 04241). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield; Level 2 historic buildings assessment; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with curtilage hedges |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | NWRR location likely to run through the site. Any large scale development on this side of town will need to consider the impact on air quality of the future development on the town centre, particularly the AQMA. Any additional vehicles entering town from this direction will impact negatively. Road to north and east noise sources. Possible air quality constraints by road junction to northeast. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Separation distance from northeast to ensure no residents exposed to unacceptable air pollution. Air quality monitoring likely to be required for at least a year by any developer to show air pollution concentrations and highlight what mitigation is necessary. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | This is a significant site dependent upon the delivery of the proposed NWRR. Other major concerns over the ecological impacts on Hencott Pool Ramsar Site, and the noise impact from the rail line. The site is over 1.0km to the nearest primary school and 1.5km to the nearest convenience store. Frequent bus service operate along Mount Pleasant Road approximately 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. A master plan for these sites would need to include new facilities such as a school and local centre (to be delivered alongside adjoining site options). |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | In time this site may have some potential alongside the delivery of the proposed NWRR. However, ahead of this a sustainable access is not considered achievable and there are other ecological and noise impacts which make this site unsustainable. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR182 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Highway access directly onto the new route of Pulley Lane with the exception of SHR185 which is promoted with access to the old route of Pully Lane south of Lower Pulley Cottages - this section of old Pulley Lane in not suitable for new development traffic and improvements could not be achieved without third party land. The left only turn onto Hereford road (from new Pully Lane) works for the current users of the new Pulley Lane route as this accommodates Bayston Hill traffic that wants to access Shrewsbury. If these sites were developed those wanting to access the A5 bypass would need to take a detour to the Meole Brace retail park roundabout - this is not ideal.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Mature trees are present on some site boundaries. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Existing young woodland on boundaries could be expanded with additional planting. Accessible Natural Greenspace provision in the area is poor. This large area could also provide benefit to existing residents if greenspace were provided near the northern boundary |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site crossed by projected line of Roman road (HER PRN 00098) and also possible that the nearby Roman roadside settlement (HER PRN 00002) extends onto the site. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Hedgerows on boundaries |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Roads to south and east causing noise and air pollution. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Separation distances to road to ensure no air pollution issues. Monitoring necessary ideally for a period of a year prior to any thorough assessment being possible. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site covers area from A5 to the south to Pulley Lane to the north. Northern part of the site (SHR185) is being promoted independently, but it is understood the two landowners are collaborating over promotion. A joint site option (SHR066, 082 and 085) would be preferred if proposed for allocation. Whilst north of the A5 the site is considered to make a contribution to the gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury. Development of this site would extend development to the by-pass which, aside from the Meole Brace Park and Ride, is beyond the extent of the current built form. Noise mitigation required as a buffer to the A5. Access to the by-pass from the site would need to use the Meole Brace junction because of the left turn only onto Hereford Road. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Concern that development onto the site could erode the gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury. Development of this site would extend development to the by-pass which, aside from the Meole Brace Park and Ride, is beyond the extent of the current built form. Access to the by-pass from the site would need to use the Meole Brace junction because of the left turn only onto Hereford Road. Other sites are considered more sustainable to contribute to the development needs of Shrewsbury up to 2036.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR183 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 9% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 9% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 91% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Access would be via an improved existing private track onto Longden Road adjacent to the Monumental Mason. Track would need to be improved to estate road standards and it is questionable whether the track is wide enough for this or whether suitable visibility can be achieved within controlled land at Longden Road. The development of the site with two or three homes would allow a private access road to be maintained which is likely to be achievable.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Almost entire area may be Environmental Network - Core Habitat and/or Corridor. There is no space on site to mitigate for the loss of the network. The network requires protection in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. The grassland may be of interest and qualify as Core/Priority Habitat. A buffer of the core habitat along the Radbrook is also required and the lower area is in Flood Zone 2 and 3. Mature trees are within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. The Radbrook is used by otters. Badgers are likely to use this site. Reptiles are possible here. In particular grass-snake.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. In particular a wide buffer to the water course. Survey site between May and August to determine grassland interest. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Every opportunity should be made to provide public access along the Radbrook. This corridor could be improved in many ways for biodiversity and people. Some shelter must be retained for otters on this route. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Site located within an area of open amenity space within the Shrewsbury Conservation Area. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance of CA). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Field site with mature trees and woodland to the north |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retain mature trees |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints identified. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Open amenity space within conservation area. Within Environmental Network. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't Allocate |
| Reasoning | Concerns in relation to its impact on the Shrewsbury Conservation Area, and in relation to the impact on the integrity of the Environmental Network. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR185 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Highway access directly onto the new route of Pulley Lane with the exception of SHR185 which is promoted with access to the old route of Pully Lane south of Lower Pulley Cottages - this section of old Pulley Lane in not suitable for new development traffic and improvements could not be achieved without third party land. The left only turn onto Hereford road (from new Pully Lane) works for the current users of the new Pulley Lane route as this accommodates Bayston Hill traffic that wants to access Shrewsbury. If these sites were developed those wanting to access the A5 bypass would need to take a detour to the Meole Brace retail park roundabout - this is not ideal.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Mature trees are present on some site boundaries. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Existing young woodland on southern western and eastern boundaries could be expanded with additional planting. Accessible Natural Greenspace provision in the area is poor. This large area could also provide benefit to existing residents if greenspace were provided near the northern or western boundary |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site crossed by projected line of Roman road (HER PRN 00098) and also possible that the nearby Roman roadside settlement (HER PRN 00002) extends onto the site. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Hedgerows on boundaries |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | NB see the negative points for site 182. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | NB see the negative points for site 182. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site covers area from A5 to the south to Pulley Lane to the north. Northern part of the site (SHR182) is being promoted independently, but it is understood the two landowners are collaborating over promotion. A joint site option (SHR066, 082 and 085) would be preferred if proposed for allocation. Whilst north of the A5 the site is considered to make a contribution to the gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury. Development of this site would extend development to the by-pass which, aside from the Meole Brace Park and Ride, is beyond the extent of the current built form. Noise mitigation required as a buffer to the A5. Access to the by-pass from the site would need to use the Meole Brace junction because of the left turn only onto Hereford Road. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't Allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Concern that development onto the site could erode the gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury. Development of this site would extend development to the by-pass which, aside from the Meole Brace Park and Ride, is beyond the extent of the current built form. Access to the by-pass from the site would need to use the Meole Brace junction because of the left turn only onto Hereford Road. Other sites are considered more sustainable to contribute to the development needs of Shrewsbury up to 2036.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR186 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 18% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>The current levels of traffic on Ellesmere Road and on the A49 bypass north of Sundorne Road roundabout constrain major development in the north of Shrewsbury and these sites should only be brought forward once the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been secured. The scheme provide alternative routes for existing traffic which reduce the current pressures on Ellesmere Road and the A49 bypass creating additional capacity for major development in north Shrewsbury. The new road will also provide a strategic access route through these sites.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. Corridor habitat that is protected under MD12 and CS17 runs around the southern and the south western boundary. This is in the form of woodland that would require survey. A pond is present just over the A528. It would need checking for GCN and other protected species - including Tubular Water-dropwort, a UK Priority Species that is recorded nearby. Boundary trees would require assessment for breeding birds and bats. Hedgerows are a priority habitat and would also support nesting birds. Polecat, a UK Priority Species, has been recorded on site and badgers may use the woodland. These species like the cover of hedgerows and scrub.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation may be required if GCN or other protected species are found. The hedgerows and mature trees in the boundary should be retained. The woodland on the southern boundary should be retained. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Site likely to harm setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033) and Grade II* Listed Albright Hussey (NHLE ref. 1295586) . May have archaeological interest relating to the battle. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield and LBs; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with curtilage hedges |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Roads to west and east creating noise and air pollution. Road junction to southwest needs consideration for air quality. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Separation distances to road to ensure no air pollution issues. Monitoring necessary ideally for a period of a year prior to any thorough assessment being possible. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site could come forward with as a comprehensive development with adjoining sites. However, the site is to the north of the A5 and therefore this would establish a direction of growth beyond a current defined and defensible boundary. In addition there are significant heritage concerns raised over the impact of development on the setting of the Registered Battlefield and to the Grade II* listed Albright Hussey. The Shrewsbury Battlefield Heritage Assessment shows that all or part of this site makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Registered Battlefield. In this respect, its sensitivity to change is moderate and whilst development is likely to cause harm to the designated heritage asset, this could be reduced or avoided through careful siting and sensitive design. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't Allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site would establish a direction of growth beyond a current defined and defensible boundary. In light of more sustainable options to the west of the town it is not felt necessary to breach the by-pass in this direction in this plan period. In addition there are significant highway and heritage concerns, in particular on the setting of the Registered Battlefield and to the Grade II* listed Albright Hussey. The Shrewsbury Battlefield Heritage Assessment shows that all or part of this site makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Registered Battlefield. In this respect, its sensitivity to change is moderate and whilst development is likely to cause harm to the designated heritage asset, this could be reduced or avoided through careful siting and sensitive design.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR187 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>This site represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. The majority of Nobold Lane (north of Mousecroft Lane) is not fronted by one of these sites so no improvements could be delivered without third party land. Together they would need to provide an new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. This is particular important as there is not direct access to the A5 bypass from Longden Road and there level of development that could be accommodated by the Longden Road route going north east to Roman Road will be limited by existing highway capacity.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Northern two fields are arable and are likely to have less ecological interest. The permanent pasture to the south may have grassland of interest. EclA required to assess this and the boundary and onsite trees for nesting birds and bats. A pond is indicated on OS maps in the southern field and on some aerial photos but other aerial photos suggest this is often dry. This will require confirmation. Ponds to the east including the one immediately adjacent in the garden and a small pond on the boundary, in the young woodland, would require survey for GCN and, if found, some mitigation for loss of terrestrial habitat may be required.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | The grassland would require survey between May and August by a very experienced botanist as pastures are difficult to assess. The on-site and nearby ponds will require assessment. The onsite ponds would require a good buffer in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network on site and to south in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. The fields to the north are of lower ecological interest. Leaving the field to the south may work. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The environmental network and small pond to the east of this area could be enhanced by opening up the pond and perhaps extending it onto the site but planting trees elsewhere along the boundary with the woodland. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site would be detached from existing built edge of town. No other known archaeological interest but very large site size suggests there may archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows, area of woodland on the boundary. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to north. Poss. landfill impacts from off site to northeast and east. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Con land remediation likely to be available where necessary. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site has potential to be part of a large strategic allocation, although it is recognised further heritage assessment is necessary. Improvement to local highway network required and impact on Strategic road network will need to be assessed. Promoted land to the south of Hanwood Road up to Longden Road offers the opportunity to consider a strategic comprehensive proposal in this direction, although it is acknowledged there are a number of different landowners and there is no known joint promotion agreement in place. These sites are over 2.0km to the nearest primary school and convenience store as third party land would be required to make suitable improvements to the existing PRoW access to Radbrook Green. Frequent bus service operate along Hanwood Road but these are around 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Whilst the site has potential to be part of a frontage into a much larger strategic allocation between the Hanwood Road and Longden Road, it is considered there is no requirement to release this land at this time in order to meet the proposed development needs of the town up to 2036, and in isolation this site is divorced from the existing built edge of the town. Land to the north between Hanwood Road and Mytton Oak road is preferred for a major expansion of the town in order to meet a significant proportion of development needs up to 2036. It is felt the preferred site offers greater potential benefits to the town and can support the objectives of the Big Town Plan and to achieve a comprehensively planned development.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR188 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>This site represents a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. The majority of Nobold Lane (north of Mousecroft Lane) is not fronted by one of these sites so no improvements could be delivered without third party land. Together they would need to provide a new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. This is particularly important as there is no direct access to the A5 bypass from Longden Road and the level of development that could be accommodated by the Longden Road route going north east to Roman Road will be limited by existing highway capacity.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>There are a few mature trees bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protect trees and hedges in boundaries |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Enhancement of env. Network by tree planting alongside the southern boundary which is currently close to network following the railway |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from nearby rail and road. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site has potential to be part of a large strategic allocation, however in isolation this site is divorced from the existing built form of the town and would not represent sustainable development. Improvements to local highway network required and impact on Strategic road network will need to be assessed. Promoted land to the south, north and east between Hanwood Road up to Longden Road offers the opportunity to consider a strategic comprehensive proposal in this direction, although it is acknowledged there are a number of different landowners and there is no known promotion agreement. These sites are over 2.0km to the nearest primary school and convenience store as third party land would be required to make suitable improvements to the existing PRow access to Radbrook Green. Frequent bus service operate along Hanwood Road but these are around 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Whilst the site has some potential to form part of a much larger strategic allocation between the Hanwood Road and Longden Road, it is considered the site in isolation does not represent sustainable development, largely by virtue of its physical separation from the existing built form. In addition heritage concerns have been raised as to potential impacts on listed buildings on site.</p> <p>In the context of the site to the north between Hanwood Road and Mytton Oak Road being preferred for significant and comprehensively planned new development, there is no requirement to release this land at this time in order to meet the proposed development needs of the town up to 2036. The preferred land to the north is considered to offer greater potential benefits to the town and can support the objectives of the Big Town Plan and to achieve a comprehensively planned development.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR189 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. The majority of Nobold Lane (north of Mousecroft Lane) is not fronted by one of these sites so no improvements could be delivered without third party land. Together they would need to provide a new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. This is particularly important as there is not direct access to the A5 bypass from Longden Road and the level of development that could be accommodated by the Longden Road route going north east to Roman Road will be limited by existing highway capacity.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. A large pond is situated on the western boundary that may support breeding GCN and other protected species. The area of development may be reduced by any mitigation required for GCN. To the north there are another 2 large pools that may also support protected species like GCN. Both are within 200m. There are occasional mature trees bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation may be required if GCN or other protected species are found. The hedgerows and mature trees in the boundary should be retained. The pool on the western boundary should have a significant buffer even if GCN are not present. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The footpath and pool could be combined to create a biodiverse green corridor that links to the community woodland and Local Wildlife Site to the north. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Potential impacts on settings of Grade II Listed Nobold Hall (NHLE ref. 1270731) and Nobold Grange (NHLE ref. 1254531). Site would be detached from existing built edge of town and would potentially also impact on the setting of the historic hamlet of Nobold. Site includes a cropmark enclosure of likely Iron Age/ Roman date. (HER PRN 04730) |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs & CA, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints identified. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site has potential to be part of a large strategic allocation, however in isolation this site is divorced from the existing built form of the town and would not represent sustainable development. Significant potential heritage impacts raised and further assessment will need to be carried out. Improvements to local highway network required and impact on Strategic road network will need to be assessed. Promoted land to the south, north and east between Hanwood Road up to Longden Road offers the opportunity to consider a strategic comprehensive proposal in this direction, although it is acknowledged there are a number of different landowners and there is no known promotion agreement. These sites are over 2.0km to the nearest primary school and convenience store as third party land would be required to make suitable improvements to the existing PRoW access to Radbrook Green. Frequent bus service operate along Hanwood Road but these are around 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Whilst the site has some potential to form part of a much larger strategic allocation between the Hanwood Road and Longden Road, it is considered the site in isolation does not represent sustainable development, largely by virtue of its physical separation from the existing built form. In addition heritage concerns have been raised as to potential impacts on Nobold Hall, Nobold Grange as well as the setting of the historic hamlet of Nobold. In the context of the site to the north between Hanwood Road and Mytton Oak Road being preferred for significant and comprehensively planned new development, there is no requirement to release this land at this time in order to meet the proposed development needs of the town up to 2036. The preferred land to the north is considered to offer greater potential benefits to the town and can support the objectives of the Big Town Plan and to achieve a comprehensively planned development.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR190 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 12% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. The majority of Nobold Lane (north of Mousecroft Lane) is not fronted by one of these sites so no improvements could be delivered without third party land. Together they would need to provide a new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. This is particularly important as there is no direct access to the A5 bypass from Longden Road and the level of development that could be accommodated by the Longden Road route going north east to Roman Road will be limited by existing highway capacity.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. One large pond and a few smaller ponds are situated within the site and another large pond appears to have recently been destroyed by this may appear in wet weather. The ponds may support breeding GCN and other protected species. The area of development may be reduced by any mitigation required for GCN. To the north there are another 3 large pools that may also support protected species like GCN. All are within 200m and one is within 35m. There are several mature trees within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows are likely to support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation may be required if GCN or other protected species are found. The hedgerows and mature trees in the boundary and within the site should be retained. The hedgerow that has recently been removed should be re-instated as a useful corridor has been removed for agricultural reasons that do not apply to development. The pools should have a significant buffer and be enhanced even if GCN are not present. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The footpath should form part of a significant green corridor that links this site to sustainable transport routes into town. This could take in the pond. Woodland planting should be considered adjacent to the woodland block to the south west. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impacts on settings of Grade II Listed Nobold Hall (NHLE ref. 1270731) and Nobold Grange (NHLE ref. 1254531). Site would be detached from existing built edge of town and would potentially also impact on the setting of the historic hamlet of Nobold. Site includes the projected line of a Roman road (HER PRN 00098) and two cropmark enclosure of likely Iron Age/ Roman date. (HER PRNs 00006 & 00009) |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs & CA, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints identified. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site has potential to be part of a large strategic allocation, however in isolation this site is divorced from the existing built form of the town and would not represent sustainable development. Significant potential heritage impacts raised and further assessment will need to be carried out. Improvements to local highway network required and impact on Strategic road network will need to be assessed. Promoted land to the south, north and east between Hanwood Road up to Longden Road offers the opportunity to consider a strategic comprehensive proposal in this direction, although it is acknowledged there are a number of different landowners and there is no known promotion agreement. These sites are over 2.0km to the nearest primary school and convenience store as third party land would be required to make suitable improvements to the existing PRoW access to Radbrook Green. Frequent bus service operate along Hanwood Road but these are around 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Whilst the site has some potential to form part of a much larger strategic allocation between the Hanwood Road and Longden Road, it is considered the site in isolation does not represent sustainable development, largely by virtue of its physical separation from the existing built form. In addition heritage concerns have been raised as to potential impacts on listed buildings on site.</p> <p>In the context of the site to the north between Hanwood Road and Mytton Oak Road being preferred for significant and comprehensively planned new development, there is no requirement to release this land at this time in order to meet the proposed development needs of the town up to 2036. The preferred land to the north is considered to offer greater potential benefits to the town and can support the objectives of the Big Town Plan and to achieve a comprehensively planned development.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR191 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>This site represents a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. The majority of Nobold Lane (north of Mousecroft Lane) is not fronted by one of these sites so no improvements could be delivered without third party land. Together they would need to provide a new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. This is particularly important as there is no direct access to the A5 bypass from Longden Road and the level of development that could be accommodated by the Longden Road route going north east to Roman Road will be limited by existing highway capacity.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats (buildings and trees), GCNs (ponds within 250m/500m), reptiles, badgers and nesting birds.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all priority habitat/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12 |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Trees and hedgerow on site boundary |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints noted. Do not know what past use of site is therefore may need to consider con land however no info on this at current time. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site has potential to be part of a large strategic allocation, however in isolation this site is divorced from the existing built form of the town and would not represent sustainable development. Improvements to local highway network required and impact on Strategic road network will need to be assessed. Promoted land to the south, north and east between Hanwood Road up to Longden Road offers the opportunity to consider a strategic comprehensive proposal in this direction, although it is acknowledged there are a number of different landowners and there is no known promotion agreement. These sites are over 2.0km to the nearest primary school and convenience store as third party land would be required to make suitable improvements to the existing PRow access to Radbrook Green. Frequent bus service operate along Hanwood Road but these are around 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Whilst the site has some potential to form part of a much larger strategic allocation between the Hanwood Road and Longden Road, it is considered the site in isolation does not represent sustainable development, largely by virtue of its physical separation from the existing built form. In the context of the site to the north between Hanwood Road and Mytton Oak Road being preferred for significant and comprehensively planned new development, there is no requirement to release this land at this time in order to meet the proposed development needs of the town up to 2036. The preferred land to the north is considered to offer greater potential benefits to the town and can support the objectives of the Big Town Plan and to achieve a comprehensively planned development.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR192 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium and Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium and Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>This site represents a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. The majority of Nobold Lane (north of Mousecroft Lane) is not fronted by one of these sites so no improvements could be delivered without third party land. Together they would need to provide a new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. This is particularly important as there is no direct access to the A5 bypass from Longden Road and the level of development that could be accommodated by the Longden Road route going north east to Roman Road will be limited by existing highway capacity.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. Two large pools are present on site. One pond if found just north of the site near Newton Farm. These may support breeding GCN. A large proportion of the area may Environmental Network - Core Habitat and/or Corridor as the grassland is indicated as possibly being of interest. If the grassland is of interest only the north eastern arable field would be available for development. The network requires protection in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. There are a large number of mature trees within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. Any buildings being removed or altered should be checked for bats, birds and other protected species.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | If the grassland is of interest there is very space on site to mitigate for the loss of the network. If newts are present mitigation would be required for the loss of terrestrial habitat. Protected species mitigation may be required if GCN or other protected species are found. The hedgerows and mature trees in the boundary should be retained. The pools should have a significant buffer even if GCN are not present. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Work to enhance the ponds and the grassland if it isn't already of high value |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site would be detached from existing built edge of town and includes historic farmstead of Day House (HER PRN 27747). Possible impact on setting of Grade II Listed Newton farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1176148). Site crossed by the projected line of a Roman roads (HER PRN 00098) and bounded to the north by a second possible Roman road (HER PRN 00057). Includes part of a cropmark enclosure of likely Iron Age/ Roman date (HER PRNs 00006). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs; Level 2 historic building appraisal if demo of Day House farm proposed; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows small copse. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible contaminated land around existing farm. Noise from road to southwest. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Contaminated land remediation likely. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site has potential to be part of a large strategic allocation, however in isolation this site is divorced from the existing built form of the town and would not represent sustainable development. Improvements to local highway network required and impact on Strategic road network will need to be assessed. Promoted land to the south, north and east between Hanwood Road up to Longden Road offers the opportunity to consider a strategic comprehensive proposal in this direction, although it is acknowledged there are a number of different landowners and there is no known promotion agreement. These sites are over 2.0km to the nearest primary school and convenience store as third party land would be required to make suitable improvements to the existing PRow access to Radbrook Green. Frequent bus service operate along Hanwood Road but these are around 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Whilst the site has some potential to form part of a much larger strategic allocation between the Hanwood Road and Longden Road, it is considered the site in isolation does not represent sustainable development, largely by virtue of its physical separation from the existing built form. In addition heritage concerns have been raised as to potential impacts on listed buildings on site.</p> <p>In the context of the site to the north between Hanwood Road and Mytton Oak Road being preferred for significant and comprehensively planned new development, there is no requirement to release this land at this time in order to meet the proposed development needs of the town up to 2036. The preferred land to the north is considered to offer greater potential benefits to the town and can support the objectives of the Big Town Plan and to achieve a comprehensively planned development.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR193 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>This site is part of a group of sites to the north of A49/A53 Battlefield Roundabout in a location where the local highway network is close to capacity at peak times. Specifically the development would add to the existing congestion on the A49 bypass between the A53 and Sundorne Road. It is unlikely that the congestion can be mitigated. Development of this scale in the location is unlikely to be acceptable in highways terms until the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been completed.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EciA required. GCN have been recorded in a pond in the south west corner. GCN have also been recorded in the garden pond to the north of this site. Boundary and in-field trees may support bats and birds and should be assessed. The hedgerows are core / priority habitat and should be retained. Reptiles may be present including grass snake.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potentially large areas may be require here to mitigate for the loss of foraging habitat for GCN. EclA would be required. Boundary and in-field trees should be retained. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | This entire area has been considered for use as a major SUDS scheme that would help free up development land further south and east and also reduce the risk of flooding of the main road (A5124). Large scale SUDS that are favourable for GCN should be considered here whatever the outcome. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible effect on setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033). May have archaeological interest relating to the battle. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield; archaeological DBA). NB. Heritage Assessment for site completed in 2018. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Occasional field tree |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise from west, possible noise from commercial to the south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is part of a represent a significant level of development in a location where the local highway network is close to capacity at peak times. Specifically the development would add to the existing congestion on the A49 bypass between the A53 and Sundorne Road. It is unlikely that the congestion can be mitigated. Development of this scale in the location is unlikely to be acceptable in highways terms until the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been completed. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is divorced from the settlement and should only come forward if SHR195 is preferred. There are also outstanding concerns relating to the heritage impact on the Registered Battlefield and the impact to the dense woodland to the north of the site. The Shrewsbury Battlefield Heritage Assessment shows that all or part of this site makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Registered Battlefield. In this respect, its sensitivity to change is moderate and whilst development is likely to cause harm to the designated heritage asset, this could be reduced or avoided through careful siting and sensitive design.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR194 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 11% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 21% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 79% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 11% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites would access the highway directly onto the new route of Pulley Lane with the exception of SHR185 which is promoted with access to the old route of Pully Lane south of Lower Pulley Cottages - this section of old Pulley Lane in not suitable for new development traffic and improvements could not be achieved without third party land. The left only turn onto Hereford road (from new Pully Lane) works for the current users of the new Pulley Lane route as this accommodates Bayston Hill traffic that wants to access Shrewsbury. If these sites were developed those wanting to access the A5 bypass would need to take a detour to the Meole Brace retail park roundabout - this is not ideal.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Protection and enhancement of Environmental Network likely to reduce the developable area of the site. Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Ecia required. The River Rea is environmental network and core habitat. It is used by otters and a wide range of other wildlife such as Kingfishers which could nest nearby. Hedgerow and some mature trees are present on the northern boundary with the River Rea.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | A large buffer (at least 50m) is require along the river with public access along the entire length. Trees and hedgerows should be retained. Surface water run-off needs to be carefully cleaned using effective SUDS features. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Significant river corridor enhancements could be made which could result in less sediments and agri-chemicals entering the water. Sustainable transport routes should be created by installing bike friendly bridges over the River Rea. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site crossed by projected line of Roman road (HER PRN 00098) and site of coal workings towards its W end. NB DBA and walkover survey completed for part of site in 2008 |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). NB DBA and walkover survey completed for part of site in 2008 |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to the south is a noise source. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site is crossed by the projected line of the Roman Road. Whilst this site constraint is manageable, it is not considered the site offers a significant opportunity to develop the objectives of the Big Town Plan. Considered there are more sustainable options for major land release to the west of the town in order to meet the development needs of the town to 2036. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Site is crossed by the projected line of the Roman Road. Whilst this site constraint is manageable, it is not considered the site offers a significant opportunity to develop the objectives of the Big Town Plan. Considered there are more sustainable options for major land release to the west of the town in order to meet the development needs of the town to 2036.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR195 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 35% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 9% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 27% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites represent a significant level of development (potentially 3,000 homes) in a location where the local highway network is close to capacity at peak times. Specifically the development would add to the existing congestion on the A49 bypass between the A53 and Sundorne Road. It is unlikely that the congestion can be mitigated. Development of this scale in the location is unlikely to be acceptable in highways terms until the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been completed.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. The west and southern boundaries for part of the Environmental Network (corridor). A small water course runs along the far southern boundary.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | The west and southern boundaries should be buffered to protect the network. The water course along the southern edge of the site should be opened up and its capacity increased. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | A feature could be made of the water course to the south. The corridor to the west could also be enhanced. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Site likely to harm setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033) and Grade II* Battlefield Church (NHLE ref. 1246192) . May have archaeological interest relating to the battle. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield and LBs; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with curtilage hedges |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Rail to west, road to south and east all noise sources. Road junction poss. air pollutant concern. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Air quality assessment following suitable monitoring by land owner/applicant to verify any assessment. Likely to result in stand off distances to the junction. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site adjoins the existing development boundary and has been considered to have long term potential in the SLAA subject to further assessment. The site is considered to have potential for adverse impacts on the Registered Battlefield and there are local and strategic highway concerns. The Shrewsbury Battlefield Heritage Assessment shows that all or part of this site makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Registered Battlefield. In this respect, its sensitivity to change is moderate and whilst development is likely to cause harm to the designated heritage asset, this could be reduced or avoided through careful siting and sensitive design. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site adjoins the existing development boundary and has been considered to have long term potential in the SLAA subject to further assessment. The site is considered to have potential for adverse impacts on the Registered Battlefield and there are local and strategic highway concerns. The Shrewsbury Battlefield Heritage Assessment shows that all or part of this site makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Registered Battlefield. In this respect, its sensitivity to change is moderate and whilst development is likely to cause harm to the designated heritage asset, this could be reduced or avoided through careful siting and sensitive design. It is therefore not considered appropriate to prefer this site for allocation for either residential or employment development.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR197 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites represent a significant level of development in a location where the local highway network is close to capacity at peak times. Specifically the development would add to the existing congestion on the A49 bypass between the A53 and Sundorne Road. It is unlikely that the congestion can be mitigated. Development of this scale in the location is unlikely to be acceptable in highways terms until the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been completed.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. Three large ponds onsite and several ponds nearby could support GCN. Mature trees are within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries and onsite. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network around most of the site in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Area of land available for development may be reduced due to mitigation required for GCN - if present. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Make a feature of the footpath to include an environmental corridor |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible effect on setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033). May have archaeological interest relating to the battle and other archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield; archaeological DBA + evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to north and west all noise sources. Road junction poss. air pollutant concern. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Air quality assessment following suitable monitoring by land owner/applicant to verify any assessment. Likely to result in stand off distances to the junction. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site has potential to accommodate a significant amount of development, with potential for mixed use including some commercial. However, concern has been raised as to the impact on the road network which is already subject to capacity constraints and the development would represent a new major direction of growth for the town. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site would represent a major new direction of growth for the town to the east of the A49 by-pass, which is considered to cause a significant degree of physical and perceived severance from the main urban area. There is concern the site is not self contained. Concern has also been raised regarding the impact on the highway network given existing levels of congestion on the A49/A53. It is not considered necessary to grow the town for in this major new direction, especially in the light of the availability of more sustainable options to the west of the town.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR197VAR |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>The variation proposal represents a moderately scaled level of development in a location where the local highway network is close to capacity at peak times. Whilst the development of a 9ha employment site would add to the existing congestion on the A49 bypass between the A53 and Sundorne Road, it is considered likely that at the level of development proposed, and resulting trip generation, any additional congestion can be mitigated through localised highway improvements. The development of the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road will further support this mitigation. This sites are over 2.5km to the nearest primary school and 1.0km to the nearest supermarket. Frequent bus service operate along the A49 and A53 and are less than 400m from the centre of the sites.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for GCNs (ponds within 500m), bats, badgers and nesting birds. Hedgerows will need to be buffered.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible effect on setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033). May have archaeological interest relating to the battle and other archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield; archaeological DBA + evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Hedgerows with connectivity on site |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Net gain for biodiversity - retain existing features and join green corridors |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to north and west all noise sources. Road junction poss. air pollutant concern. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Air quality assessment following suitable monitoring by land owner/applicant to verify any assessment. Likely to result in stand off distances to the junction. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The proposal is for a 9ha employment site solely. This variation on SHR197 therefore does not include any element of residential. An updated Transport Statement (TS) has been prepared for the site by the site promoters on the basis of this revised site option, indicating a less than severe impact. Appropriate access can be achieved from the A53, although it is considered there will be a need for localised highway improvements. The TS also highlights the potential for non-car journeys, siting the presence of bus provision to the site. The site offers the opportunity to provide a moderately scaled employment site on the edge of the county's strategic centre, complementing the more strategic site employment options in the town. It is considered therefore the site's scale could provide an important role in promoting choice to the commercial market, on a gateway location benefiting from direct access to the A53. The site is located to the east of the A49 and would therefore represent a new direction of growth for the town. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Localised highway improvements will be required, but it is considered in principle these can be achieved given the scale and nature of the proposal. A heritage assessment will be required to inform the design and layout of the development. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | |
| Potential for Windfall? | yes |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Allocate for employment only |
| Reasoning | <p>As opposed to the original SHR197 proposal, this variation solely seeks the allocation of a 9 ha employment site. The scale of the proposal is considered to be complementary to the other development employment proposals in the town. Whilst the proposal is located to the east of the A49 and therefore represents a new direction of growth for the town beyond the A49, it is considered the nature of the revised site proposal conforms with the county's wider aspiration to support opportunities for economic growth, especially with regard to utilisation of opportunities on transport corridors. It is considered a safe highway access is achievable, although it is likely localised improvements will be required.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | 9ha |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>This site offers the opportunity for a moderately scaled new employment area to the east of the town. Access is proposed from the A53.</p> <p>It is envisaged this site could be development for a wide range of employment uses including B1, B2 and B8. Suitable boundary treatment will be required through the provision of hedgerows, tree planting and green infrastructure, reflecting the sites' location to the east of the A49.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR198 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium and Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium and Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low and Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low and Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites represent a significant level of development in a location where the local highway network is close to capacity at peak times. Specifically the development would add to the existing congestion on the A49 bypass between the A53 and Sundorne Road. It is unlikely that the congestion can be mitigated. Development of this scale in the location is unlikely to be acceptable in highways terms until the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been completed.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>EclA required. Much of this area is arable farmland with few ecological constraints. The ponds (of which there are at least 9 on site and others nearby) are likely to be core / priority habitat and at least two support GCN. Grassland just north of Astley Park may be priority / core habitat. In-field and boundary trees are of interest. A few small blocks of woodland are likely to be core / priority habitat and may also support protected species like bats, birds, badgers, etc. The small block on the far west with the pools is protected under an area TPO. The area available for development could be restricted by the need to mitigate for GCN.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | EclA would be required early on for this site. All pools would require survey including for species like Tubular Water-dropwort which is UK Priority. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | A site of this scale would have significant opportunities and could make the most of the existing features. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible effect on setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033). May have archaeological interest relating to the battle and other archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield; archaeological DBA + evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land one copse of mature trees central to site |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Commercial to south-west and east. Road to the south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site is divorced from the town. Potential for employment use. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site would represent a major new direction of growth for the town to the north east of the A49 by-pass, which is considered to cause a significant degree of physical and perceived severance from the main urban area. There is concern the site is not self contained. Concern has also been raised regarding the impact on the highway network given existing levels of congestion on the A49/A53. It is not considered necessary to grow the town in this major new direction, especially in the light of the availability of more sustainable options to the west of the town. There is some potential for the site to be considered for employment purposes, although the landscape and visual impact considerations will need to be managed through design and layout.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR199 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 97% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 16% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>This employment site has potential for direct access onto the A5 bypass at Preston Boats roundabout. An new junction onto the A5 south of the roundabout might be difficult to achieve and unacceptable to Highways England. A scheme to create a new 4th arm at the roundabout could be very costly.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Mature trees are within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. The northern field is surrounded by the Env Network - buffer to the river to the west, line of trees alongside the A5 and the water course that runs through the site. The water course running through the site is buffered by the network. The majority of the site is arable which has low biodiversity interest but the buffers forming the network still require consideration under CS17 and MD12. Otters are very likely to use the water course. Development should not impact this.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to north, west and through the site in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12 |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The water course could be enhanced to make a feature and its capacity increased to help address flooding issues. In-line pools and 'leaky dams' should be considered. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site contains part of a rectangular cropmark enclosure of possible prehistoric/ Roman date (HER PRN 04472) |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land divided by a liner group of trees or hedgerow |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No significant constraints assuming farm would be developed. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | Available for employment uses only. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | Access is a significant concern, with a new arm from the Preston Boats roundabout potentially undermining viability. Not considered a good location for mixed-use development which further undermines the viability of the site. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR200 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 9% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>part of a group of promoted sites to the east of Ellesmere Road. Current levels of traffic on Ellesmere Road and on the A49 bypass north of Sundorne Road roundabout constrain major development in the north of Shrewsbury and these sites should only be brought forward once the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road has been secured. The scheme provide alternative routes for existing traffic which reduce the current pressures on Ellesmere Road and the A49 bypass creating additional capacity for major development in north Shrewsbury. The new road will also provide a strategic access route through these sites.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA will be required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination), possible drainage and recreational impacts on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. Potentially on route of NWRR?</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (trees and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. There are TPO'd trees in the northern boundary.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Large field site some scattered mature curtilage hedge trees a number on TPO's to the north |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retain existing trees and Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to the east. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Would form part of a new area of growth to the west of Ellesmere Road. In its own right the site is separated from the main built form on the west of Ellesmere Road. Significant highway constraints. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | In time this site may have some potential alongside the delivery of the proposed NWRR. However, ahead of this a sustainable access is not considered achievable and there are other ecological and noise impacts which make this site unsustainable. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR203 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 14% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 86% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 9% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 15% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 27% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Direct access onto the Battlefield Road in the vicinity of the Shillingston Drive Ghost Island Right Turn junction. The developer would need to be able to demonstrate that a staggered GIRT T-junction operated safely or provide a new roundabout junction to serve Shillingston Drive and the new development.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>The lower part of the site is within the flood zones 2 and 3 and therefore in the environmental network. The western border along the rail line is also corridor. Significant in-field trees are likely to support birds and bats. The hedgerows / lines of trees and scrubby area near the entrance may also support nesting birds and perhaps reptiles. A pond 85m to the north west supports GCN.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | EclA required. In-field and boundary trees should be retained. A GCN licence and some mitigation is likely due to the presence GCN in the nearby pond. The water course along the southern boundary should be opened up and the carrying capacity increased. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The Environmental Network could be enhanced around the western boundary and in particular on the southern boundary by making better use of the water course. SUDS features should consider the needs of GCN and may be required as mitigation. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible effect on setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033). . |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Scattered field trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Odour and noise potential from commercial to the south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site is currently allocated for employment development. Part of site in flood zone 2 and within 1000 year surface flood risk zone. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No for housing |
| Recommendation | Retain for employment |
| Reasoning | The site is currently allocated for housing in the SAMDev Plan and there is no overarching need to move away from this position given the availability of other sites. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR204 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 12% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 1% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Direct access onto Battlefield Road. Achieving a safe access onto Battlefield Road so close to the A49/A53 Battlefield Roundabout might be challenging. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | The woodland block to the south is protected by and area TPO. Environmental corridor runs around most of the other boundaries. The grassland may be of interest and would require survey between May and August. A footpath runs across the site. The ponds south of the site may contain GCN. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | EclA required. In-field and boundary trees should be retained. A buffer would be needed to the TPO trees as well as the in-field tree. Some mitigation may be required if the pond to the south of the site has GCN. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The Environmental Network could be enhanced around the boundary by additional woodland planting. In particular on the southern boundary. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible effect on setting of Shrewsbury Registered Battlefield (NHLE ref. 1000033). May have archaeological interest relating to the battle. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (settings of Battlefield; archaeological DBA + evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Well established hedges and occasional field trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise and air pollution from roads to the northwest through to southeast. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Due to small site may be difficult to sort through separation. Separation likely to be required to ensure no air pollution concerns. Thorough assessment following air quality monitoring a prerequisite. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site is currently allocated for employment development. Significant distance from town centre and residential use is not considered to offer opportunity to meet objectives of the Big Town Plan. Noise and air quality mitigation needed which will be difficult to achieve due to the scale of the site. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No for housing |
| Recommendation | Retain for employment |
| Reasoning | The site is currently allocated for housing in the SAMDev Plan and there is no overarching need to move away from this position given the availability of other sites. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR205 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 9% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | These site are part of the Western Sustainable Urban Extension and vehicular access will be provided through the new Oxon Link Road and associated local highway network modifications. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclIA required. There are a large number of mature trees within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Pasture may be species rich grassland that would be Core or corridor habitat. A pond is present 130m to the north east and over the road which may require survey or HSI for GCN. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network around most of the site in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Enhance Environmental Network by additional tree planting. Creating pools, or designing SUDS feature, that are suitable for GCN. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but medium size suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Significant trees and groups of trees on and adjacent to the site. May limit developable land on the site. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to west and north (noise and air pollution) |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Due to small site may be difficult to sort through separation. Separation likely to be required to ensure no air pollution concerns. Thorough assessment following air quality monitoring a prerequisite. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site is currently allocated for employment development as part of Shrewsbury West SUE. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No for housing |
| Recommendation | Retain for employment |
| Reasoning | Site is currently allocated for employment development as part of Shrewsbury West SUE. The site has a resolution for approval for employment use. Good employment location and important to the balanced development within the allocated SUE. No requirement to allocate for housing in light of other available options |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR206 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | These site are part of the Western Sustainable Urban Extension and vehicular access will be provided through the new Oxon Link Road and associated local highway network modifications. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. There are a large number of mature trees within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Two ponds are found within 100m of the site and one found at 120m. Ponds in the area are known to have GCN. A licence may be required and fencing used during construction. The grassland may be species rich and could be defined as Core / Priority Habitat and therefore be considered in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network around most of the site in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Creation of environmental networks - in particular along the southern boundary should be considered and the creation of pools and low nutrient areas by topsoil stripping. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | NB. DBA produced in 2013. Archaeological evaluation can be secured by condition. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with some significant trees and groups of trees on and adjacent to the site and on the site boundaries. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | On site of proposed new road. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | New road would place sig constraints and noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation through stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site is currently allocated for employment development as part of Shrewsbury West SUE. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No for housing |
| Recommendation | Retain for employment |
| Reasoning | <p>Site is currently allocated for employment development as part of Shrewsbury West SUE. Good employment location and important to the balanced development within the allocated SUE. No requirement to allocate for housing in light of other available options</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR207 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | These site are part of the Western Sustainable Urban Extension and vehicular access will be provided through the new Oxon Link Road and associated local highway network modifications. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EcIA required. At least one pond is present on site. Two ponds are found on the site and these may support breeding GCN. Mitigation land required for GCN may impact the area of land available for development - in particular if GCN are found on site. The area required may impact the viability of any development here. Mature trees are present within and bordering this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. The grassland may be species rich and could be defined as Core / Priority Habitat and therefore be considered in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network around most of the site in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The north east corner of this area has already been developed. The opportunity should be taken to create a wide buffer alongside the planned route of the road which would incorporate the existing hedge lines and also build in sustainable transport routes. Pools should be created along this route and topsoil stripping would improve biodiversity and also help reduce maintenance costs. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impacts on settings of Grade II Listed Oxon Hall (NHLE ref. 1366918). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (setting of LB). NB. DBA produced in 2013. Archaeological evaluation can be secured by condition. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with some significant trees and groups of trees on and adjacent to the site and on the site boundaries. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Close to new proposed road. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | New road would place sig constraints and noise. Commercial to the north. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation through stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site is the northern extent of the current Shrewsbury West SUE. Currently identified for Healthcare/Commercial uses in the adopted Masterplan. Not considered necessary to depart from this agreed position especially in light of other options and the need to balance housing and employment growth. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain existing allocation |
| Reasoning | <p style="text-align: center;">Site is the northern extent of the current Shrewsbury West SUE. Currently identified for Healthcare/Commercial uses in the adopted Masterplan. Not considered necessary to depart from this agreed position especially in light of other options and the need to balance housing and employment growth.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR208 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | These site are part of the Western Sustainable Urban Extension and vehicular access will be provided through the new Oxon Link Road and associated local highway network modifications. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. A few mature trees bordering this site may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. A large pond is present 80m to the north and another in a garden 105m to the east. These may support GCN. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected species mitigation and enhancement is likely to be limited if at all. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Enhance Env. Network to the south of the site in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Enhance Environmental Network by additional tree planting. Creating pools, or designing SUDS feature, that are suitable for GCN. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Occasional tree on site, shelter belt and hedgerows around site boundaries. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Close to new proposed road. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to west and south (noise and air quality due to proximity to busy junction). |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation through stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources however may significantly constrain the site. Air quality assessment following monitoring by developer necessary and a prerequisite to any planning application being brought forward. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site is currently allocated for employment development as part of Shrewsbury West SUE. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Not for housing |
| Recommendation | Retain employment allocation |
| Reasoning | Site is currently allocated for employment development as part of Shrewsbury West SUE. The site has a resolution for approval for employment use. Good employment location and important to the balanced development within the allocated SUE. No requirement to allocate for housing in light of other available options |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR210 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | The site is directly south of the town's Western Sustainable Urban Extension and vehicular access will be provided through the new Oxon Link Road and associated local highway network modifications. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others). Otherwise none |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | GCN may breed in a large pool (reedbed filter) 90m to the south. The woodland, scrub and individual trees to the south and east may be of significance for biodiversity and is protected by CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Existing vegetation (course grassland?) may retain some interest. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Retain the environmental network and individual mature trees along the southern and eastern boundary. Provide mitigation for protected species if any found. Grassland / or tall herb vegetation currently present could be enhanced in areas left. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Enhancement of env. Network by tree planning alongside the southern or eastern boundary. For any areas of open space consider removing fertile topsoil to create low fertility conditions. Existing vegetation may have some value that could be enhanced by regular management. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | NB. DBA produced in 2013. Archaeological evaluation can be secured by condition. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Significant shelter belt on boundary, some scattered trees across site and hedgerow boundaries. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | On site/near of proposed new road. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | New road would place sig constraints and noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation through stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Available for employment only. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | yes - for employment |
| Potential for Allocation? | No for housing |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>The site could present a windfall opportunity to extend the existing commercial area of the towns West SUE.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR213 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 88% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 89% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 11% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 47% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Very High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Access arrangements onto Woodcote way will need to be carefully assessed due to the close proximity of the A5112 roundabout and the new Redwings development access. Modifications to the roundabout may be required or access could be incorporated into a modified roundabout.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>The north east boundary of this area is Local Wildlife Site and Priority habitat / Core Habitat in the Environmental Network. Mature trees and hedgerow border much of this site. The trees and hedgerows may support bats and nesting birds as well as being habitat in their own right. Hedgerow is Core / Priority Habitat. A water course runs along the south eastern boundary and would require a large buffer.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Being in the flood plain would be difficult to mitigate for without having impacts further downstream. Buffers would be needed to the river and the water course to the south east. The small area outside the floodplain could be developed with few ecological impacts. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The water course could be enhanced to make a feature and its capacity increased to help address flooding issues. In-line pools and 'leaky dams' should be considered. For any areas of open space consider removing fertile topsoil to create low fertility conditions. Soil can be used elsewhere on site where amenity planting is required or to create interesting topography for kids and biodiversity features like hibernacula. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with trees next to river creating a buffer |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Nationally modelled Noise Action Zone to the south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation through stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources however may significantly constrain the site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | Vast majority of site is in flood zones 2 and 3 leaving only around 1ha of developable land. High landscape sensitivity, and medium/high visual sensitivity. The site is approximately 1.0km from the nearest supermarket, 1.5km from the nearest school. Regular bus services operate along Woodcote Way which is adjacent to the site. There is a good pedestrian and cycle network in the vicinity. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>Vast majority of site is in flood zones 2 and 3 leaving only around 1ha of developable land. High landscape sensitivity, and medium/high visual sensitivity. More preferable sites elsewhere.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHR216 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High and Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | High and Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High and Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High and Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | SHR162 is part of SHR216 which has the potential to deliver 694 homes. Access would be onto Holy Head Road. Land would need to be protected to deliver the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road across the southern part of the site. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Part of the northern section of the site is within Shelton Rough Local Wildlife Site (and Env. Network core areas). The LWS is directly adjacent to the eastern boundary. The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. Appropriate buffers from the LWS and adjacent woodland will be required. The central hedgerow should be retained and enhanced. Requires botanical survey, ECLA and surveys for bats (trees and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, otters and nesting birds. PROWS cross the site. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | If priority habitat, site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Potential impact on setting of Registered Park and Garden of Berwick Park (NHLE ref. 1001706) No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of RPG; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Numerous scattered mature field trees adjacent to good woodland screening boundary to the river |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Open field areas |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible road noise to southwest of the site and commercial noise to the south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site offers an opportunity for a greenfield land release on the edge of Shrewsbury. It is recognised the site falls within Bicton parish. SHR162 is part of SHR216. Access would be onto Holy Head Road. If allocated land would need to be protected to deliver the Shrewsbury North West Relief Road across the southern part of the site. It is recognised the site has a high visual sensitivity rating and a medium/high landscape sensitivity rating. Impact at Spring Coppice and to the east of the site at Shelton Rough adjacent to the River Severn are particular concerns. Some ecological concerns. Impact on Groundwater Source Protection Zone highlighted by EA as significant. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Land to the south to the south of the site should be protected for the potential future alignment of the NWRR. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p>This site was included as a proposed allocation for 300 dwellings in the Preferred Options document in November 2018. However, the site was subject to substantial objection, and in particular significant concern was raised by the Environment Agency regarding the potential impact from development on the Source Protection Zone in the area, and associated impacts on the quality of water supply for the town. Therefore whilst the site does offer some locational benefits, especially in terms of its broadly sustainable location on the edge of Shrewsbury, the weight of material objections weighing negatively in the balance of considerations alongside landscape concerns, and the fact there are other options in the town to deliver housing in a more sustainable manner, it is now considered this site should no longer be proposed for allocation and remain open countryside.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>This site was included as a proposed allocation for 300 dwellings in the Preferred Options document in November 2018. However, the site was subject to substantial objection, and in particular significant concern was raised by the Environment Agency regarding the potential impact from development on the Source Protection Zone in the area, and associated impacts on the quality of water supply for the town. Therefore whilst the site does offer some locational benefits, especially in terms of its broadly sustainable location on the edge of Shrewsbury, the weight of material objections weighing negatively in the balance of considerations alongside landscape concerns, and the fact there are other options in the town to deliver housing in a more sustainable manner, it is now considered this site should no longer be proposed for allocation and remain open countryside.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR217 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Potentially 97 homes. Existing access arrangements onto Otley Road are not ideal for traffic to/from Oteley road east. |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | The site boundaries and part of the site lie within Env. Network corridor. This should be retained and buffered. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats (buildings, trees and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Curtilage mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Large central open areas |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Well screened site - retain to existing trees and create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from roads and commercial in close proximity. Possible air quality issues due to close proximity to t significant junction. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. Air quality monitoring on site required and assessment done using the information. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site no longer available for residential development. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Don't allocate |
| Reasoning | <p style="text-align: center;">Site no longer available for residential development</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR218 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 23% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Very High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>Potentially 116 homes. Access arrangements onto Woodcote way will need to be carefully assessed due to the close proximity of the A5112 roundabout and the new Redwings development access. Modifications to the roundabout may be required or access could be incorporated into a modified roundabout. Access should be linked with SHR099. The site is approximately 1.0km from the nearest supermarket, 1.5km from the nearest school. Regular bus services operate along Woodcote Way which is adjacent to the site. There is a good pedestrian and cycle network in the vicinity.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others).</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for GCNs (ponds within 500m), bats, badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Hedgerows and trees will need to be buffered.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site includes historic farmstead of Underdale Hall Farm (HER PRN 26952), where both the farm house and the principal range of farm buildings survive. No other known archaeological interest but medium size suggests site may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (buildings assessment; archaeological DBA + ?evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Scattered mature trees and groups of trees on site |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Low density houses retaining existing trees |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Flood risk. Currently site of employment. Noise assessment required for road. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Site would represent a significant growth area for the town. Highway access considered achievable. Landscape sensitivity considered high |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Don't allocate</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>It is considered more sustainable options exist elsewhere in the town to accommodate the planned level of growth to 2038.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR219 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low and Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low and Medium |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. The majority of Nobold Lane (north of Mousecroft Lane) is not fronted by one of these sites so no improvements could be delivered without third party land. Together they would need to provide an new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. This is particular important as there is not direct access to the A5 bypass from Longden Road and there level of development that could be accommodated by the Longden Road route going north east to Roman Road will be limited by existing highway capacity. These sites are over 2.0km to the nearest primary school and convenience store as third party land would be required to make suitable improvements to the existing PRoW access to Radbrook Green. Frequent bus service operate along Hanwood Road but these are around 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>If priority habitats are present then these areas should not be developed.</p> <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others).</p> <p>Protection of ponds on the site will reduce the no. of houses possible.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required.</p> <p>There are ponds on the site. Retention and protection of the ponds (with appropriate buffers) will reduce the no. of houses possible.</p> <p>A significant proportion of the site is made up of wet woodland / swamp which is almost certainly core / priority habitat. A large proportion of the area may Env. Network core habitat and/or corridor as the grassland is indicated as possibly being of interest. If the grassland is of interest, only the north eastern arable field would be available for development.</p> <p>Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds.</p> <p>Hedgerows, trees and ponds will need to be buffered.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | If priority habitats are present, those areas of the site should not be developed. Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The wet woodland could be improved for wildlife and potentially for people with a boardwalk through the area created. Woodland planting along the southern boundary would help the network here and also reduce road noise. The footpath should form part of a significant green corridor that links this site to sustainable transport routes into town. Woodland planting should be considered adjacent to the woodland block to the south west. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impacts on settings of Grade II Listed Nobold Hall (NHLE ref. 1270731) and Nobold Grange (NHLE ref. 1254531). Site detached from built edge of town and would potentially impact on the setting of the historic hamlet of Nobold and includes historic farmstead of Day House (HER PRN 27747). Potential impact on setting of Grade II Listed Newton farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1176148). Site crossed by the projected line of possible Roman road (HER PRN 00057) and includes the projected line of a Roman road (HER PRN 00098) and two cropmark enclosure of likely Iron Age/ Roman date. (HER PRNs 00006 & 00009). The site is also bounded to the north by a second possible Roman road (HER PRN 00057). No other known archaeological interest but large size of site and proximity to the Roman road suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs & CA; Level 2 historic building appraisal if demo of Day House farm proposed; and archaeological DBA + field evaluation). NB part of the site previously used as site compound during A5 construction. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Hedgerows and mature hedgerow trees, scattered mature field trees and areas of woodland around seasonal pond and adjacent to highway. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | tree planting across the site, increase area of woodland along highway. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from road, assessment required, more suitable for employment. Odours from cattle market. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is a combination of several previously assessed parcels. Would represent a major expansion of Shrewsbury in a new direction. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Don't allocate</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is being promoted in a comprehensive package of sites alongside adjoining land. However, this it is considered the site is significantly divorced from the town. There are also heritage concerns regarding potential impact on the Roman Road, and noise impacts from the A5 and rail line. It is not considered this site represents the most sustainable option for the town's growth given the presence of other options.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | SHR221 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | <p>These sites represent a partial fill of the remaining undeveloped land between the Mytton Oak Road and the Radbrook Road. Together they would need to provide an new circular link road, between the existing radial roads, in order to facilitate public transport services to the new developments and improve accessibility by car. These sites are over 1.5km to the nearest primary school and convenience store. Frequent bus service operate along Mytton Oak Road and Hanwood Road but these are around 800m from the centre of the sites. It would therefore be preferable for this area to be developed as a sustainable urban extension to include local facilities and through route public transport services.</p> |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | <p>If priority habitats are present then these areas should not be developed.</p> <p>HRA may be required for NOx pollution from increased traffic, in-combination with other sites on White Mere, Sweatmere and Crose Mere and Clarepool Moss, Hencott Pool (possibly others).</p> <p>Protection of ponds on the site (one of which is a confirmed GCN breeding pond) will greatly reduce the no. of houses possible.</p> |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | <p>There are ponds on the site (one of which is a confirmed GCN breeding pond) Retention and protection of the ponds (with appropriate buffers) will greatly reduce the no. of houses possible.</p> <p>. Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds.</p> <p>Hedgerows, trees and ponds will need to be buffered.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | If priority habitats are present, those areas of the site should not be developed. Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site includes park like ground and may affect the setting of Ley Grange - a non-designated historic house of some status. No known archaeological interest but large size suggests site may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (setting assessment; archaeological DBA + evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Numerous mature trees in hedgerows and across the existing fields, would limit development opportunities |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting across site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No comment, no apparent noise sources identified. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | The site is adjacent to the proposed allocated land of SHR060/158/160 |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Don't allocate</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Whilst adjoining the proposed allocation of SHR060/158/160, the site is not considered to be required in order to make this proposal more sustainable. It is not being considered as part of the 'package' of sites as part of a comprehensive land promotion agreement. The site is not required for access from Mytton Oak Road.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Community Hub: Baschurch

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP008 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: | 2% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 9% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: | 17% |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | B5067 not Nobold. |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Pedestrian access onto Nobold to be provided and a footway along the frontage of the site along the south side of Nobold and within the existing highway west of the site frontage linking to existing footways on Nobold to the west of the site frontage. Vehicle and footway links to BNP024 should be provided on the southern boundary of the site. Potentially 132 homes. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. See LPR HRA. Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network, gun mitigation/enhancement unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision. Suggest seek landscape advice. If GCN are present in the pool and / or the grassland is priority / core habitat, then the reduced area available for development after mitigation/enhancement should be taken into consideration. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Surveys for GCN (in ponds adjacent), Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey). Environmental Network. Ecological connectivity through the site to link The Meadows in the north to the pond to the south required. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Remove area from allocation as will be required to buffer adjacent biodiversity feature? |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Link open space to surrounding green corridors to enhance Env. Network. Enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Provide additional pond habitat. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. amphibian friendly gully pots. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Site immediately adjacent to SW boundary Baschurch Centre Conservation Area and may effect it's setting. HER holds record for the field name (HER PRN 05080). Otherwise no known archaeological interest but large size suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of CA, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant field and boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to east |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>An irregularly shaped site located to the west of Baschurch. Site boundaries are defined by agricultural field boundaries.</p> <p>A well used public footpath crosses the site, which is considered to be a locally valued green-space.</p> <p>17% of the site is within 20m of a detailed river network.</p> <p>HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites. Ecological survey will be needed to determine presence/absence of Great Crested Newts in pools on site and presence/absence of priority habitat. If either or both are confirmed, the developable area of the site is likely to be significantly reduced to allow for mitigation/enhancement measures.</p> <p>Potential impact on the setting of Baschurch Centre Conservation Area. The site may also have archaeological potential.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain open countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>A well used public footpath crosses the site, which is considered to be a locally valued green-space.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP014 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | B5067 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. See LPR HRA. Seek landscape advice. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Surveys for Bats and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Re-create/restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. Landscape opportunities allow for native species planting. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Site partially within Baschurch Centre Conservation Area but currently occupied by a modern garage building. Site of former village smithy in SW corner of site, so some limited archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance of CA, archaeological DBA). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Well designed redevelopment of site may enhance character and appearance of CA |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Industrial land, some boundary trees. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Noise form surrounding commercial and roads. Poss. contaminated land from past land use. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Contaminated land remediation likely. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Removing commercial from the area where there are surrounding residential areas may improve amenity in noise terms for surrounding area. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site consists of a brownfield site within the built form of the village. The site is currently occupied by a Garage building and its curtilage.</p> <p>Any loss of commercial uses and employment will require due consideration.</p> <p>HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites.</p> <p>The site is partially within the Baschurch Centre Conservation Area. The site may also have archaeological potential.</p> <p>Noise from surrounding commercial uses will require due consideration.</p> <p>As a brownfield site it may be subject to contamination.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>Yes</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Potential windfall site within the built form of the village</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>A brownfield site within the built form of the village. Any loss of commercial uses and employment will require due consideration.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP017 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 1% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | B4397 |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | N |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. Subject to a review and appropriate modifications of the existing speed limit and the provision of pedestrian facilities including a crossing of the B4397 to assist pedestrian access to the village. Potentially 546 homes. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. See LPR HRA. Natural England must be consulted as IRZ layer says: Any residential developments with a total net gain in residential units. ¹ Drainage information would be required upfront. Site is adjacent to Boreatton Moss LWS. Suggest seek landscape advice and buffer to protect Natural Asset. Ponds within 500m - If GCN are present in the pool and / or the grassland is priority / core habitat, then the reduced area available for development after mitigation/enhancement should be taken into consideration. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Surveys for GCN (in ponds adjacent), Dormice (known records nearby), Badgers (known), Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey), reptiles. Environmental Network? |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Buffers would be needed to the Protect, enhance and restore LWS, possibly requiring greater open space provision. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. Landscape opportunities allow for native species planting. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm. Creating pools, or designing SUDS feature, that are suitable for GCN. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impact on the setting of Baschurch Centre Conservation Area. Site includes three cropmark ring ditches (HER PRNs 02398, 04038 and 04086), which are likely to form part of a dispersed Early Bronze Age barrow cemetery. There are also a number of metal detectorist finds from the field, including an Anglo-Saxon strap end, which suggest additional. archaeological interest. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of CA, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land . |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to south and west as a noise source. Commercial to one small part on the western boundary. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Baschurch is a very linear settlement (north-south). In order to ensure effective access to services and a cohesive and sustainable settlement the preference is to limit further elongation of the built form through development to the north or south. A very large site located to the north of Baschurch. Site boundaries are defined by built form to the south and agricultural field boundaries to east and west. The sites northern boundary is undefined.</p> <p>Whilst the sites southern boundary adjoins Baschurch, due to its large size its northern element has a more limited relationship to the villages built form.</p> <p>Vehicular access is subject to a review and appropriate modifications of the existing speed limit and the provision of pedestrian facilities including a crossing of the B4397 to assist pedestrian access to the village. HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites. Ecological survey will be needed to determine presence/absence of Great Crested Newts in pools within 500m and presence/absence of priority habitat on site. If either or both are confirmed, the developable area of the site is likely to be significantly reduced to allow for mitigation/enhancement measures and for buffering of adjacent Wildlife Site.</p> <p>Potential impact on the setting of Baschurch Centre Conservation Area. The site also contains cropmark ring ditches which are an indication of a dispersed Early Bronze Age barrow cemetery on the site and there is likely further archaeological interest on the site.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain open countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Baschurch is a very linear settlement (north-south). In order to ensure effective access to services and a cohesive and sustainable settlement the preference is to limit further elongation of the built form through development to the north or south. This is a very large site located to the north of Baschurch. Whilst the sites southern boundary adjoins Baschurch, due to its large size its northern element has a more limited relationship to the villages built form.</p> <p>There is evidence of a dispersed Early Bronze Age barrow cemetery on the site.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP021 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Eyton Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. With appropriate improvements to Eyton Lane along the frontage the site which is split either side of the lane to deliver a wider road, extended speed limit and pedestrian facilities. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | N. The capacity of Eyton Lane west of the site and the Eyton Lane junction with the B5067 is very restricted due to the narrowness of the road and poor visibility at the junction. Significant traffic calming has been introduced to restrict vehicle speeds and improve safety and this has further reduced capacity. This section of Eyton Lane is not suitable for, and can not be improved to accommodate the traffic associated with this site. Potentially 372 homes. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Natural England must be consulted as IRZ layer says: Any residential developments with a total net gain in residential units.' Consider not allocating this site as within the surface water catchment of Fenemere Ramsar site. Drainage information would be required upfront. The Environmental Network could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. Suggest seek landscape advice. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants, Environmental Network. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Buffers would be needed to the Protect, enhance and restore LWS, possibly requiring greater open space provision. Re-create/restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Link open space to surrounding green corridors to enhance Env. Network. Provide access to green space from surrounding existing housing. Enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. Creating pools, or designing SUDS feature, that are suitable for GCN. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Two cropmark complexes are present on the site (HER PRNs 04036 & 04037), which may represent field systems, and there are other cropmarks of likely prehistoric date in the immediate vicinity. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant field and boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road through site |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is located to the east of the built form of Baschurch, consisting of a series of agricultural fields. It is divided into two sections by Eyston Lane. The southern element of the site adjoins the built form of Baschurch to its west and open space to the north-west, although it continues further east than these areas of open space. Boundaries are defined by built form to the west, the road to the north and field boundaries to south and east. The northern element abuts the areas of open space on its western boundary, however it continue further north abutting development land to the north-west, boundaries are defined by the road to the south, open space/development site to the west and field boundaries to north and east. The site is very large.</p> <p>Vehicular access is not achievable for this scale of development: this section of Eyton Lane is not suitable and cannot be improved.</p> <p>HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites and may show that development is not possible.</p> <p>Cropmarks may indicate archaeological potential.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain open countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is very large.</p> <p>Vehicular access is not achievable for this scale of development: this section of Eyton Lane is not suitable and cannot be improved.</p> <p>Concern about impact on ecology impacts.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP022 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | It appears that access onto Loveridge Drive is not available. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | N. It is questionable whether the final (eastern end) section of Loveridge Drive can be suitably extended / modified to take traffic from this site. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. Subject to a capacity assessment of Kings Drive / B5067 junction. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Consider not allocating this site as may be within the surface water catchment of Fenemere Ramsar site. Drainage information would be required upfront. Suggest seek landscape advice. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants, Environmental Network. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Re-create/restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Link open space to surrounding green corridors to enhance Env. Network. Provide access to green space from surrounding existing housing. Enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. Creating pools, or designing SUDS feature, that are suitable for GCN. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest on the site itself but there are cropmarks of likely prehistoric date in the immediate vicinity. Medium size may also suggest there is some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant field and boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site lies to the east of Baschurch consisting of part of a larger agricultural field. Site boundaries are defined by built form to the west, and field boundaries to north and south, however the eastern boundary is undefined.</p> <p>Vehicular access is unlikely to be achievable as the final (eastern end) section of Loveridge Drive cannot be suitably extended/modified to take traffic from this site. In any event a capacity assessment of Kings Drive/B5067 junction would be needed. HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites and may show that development is not possible.</p> <p>the site may be of archaeological interest.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Remain open countryside |
| Reasoning | <p>Vehicular access is unlikely to be achievable as the final (eastern end) section of Loveridge Drive cannot be suitably extended/modified to take traffic from this site. In any event a capacity assessment of Kings Drive/B5067 junction would be needed.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP023 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 11% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | B5067 not Nobold. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Pedestrian access onto Nobold to be provided and a footway along the frontage of the site along the south side of Nobold and within the existing highway west of the site frontage linking to existing footways on Nobold to the west of the site frontage. Potentially 70 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network, gun mitigation/enhancement unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision. Suggest seek landscape advice. If GCN are present in the pool and / or the grassland is priority / core habitat, then the reduced area available for development after mitigation/enhancement should be taken into consideration. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Surveys for GCN (in ponds adjacent), Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey). Environmental Network. Ecological connectivity through the site to link The Meadows in the north to the pond to the south required. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Remove area from allocation as will be required to buffer adjacent biodiversity feature |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Link open space to surrounding green corridors to enhance Env. Network. Enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Provide additional pond habitat. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. amphibian friendly gully pots. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Site immediately adjacent to SW boundary Baschurch Centre Conservation Area and may effect it's setting. HER holds record for the field name (HER PRN 05080). Otherwise no known archaeological interest but medium size suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of CA, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant field and boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise from roads to east and north |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site consists of the eastern portion of BNPO08. The site is well related to the built form of the village, with its northern boundary defined by residential curtilages and a road, its eastern boundary defined by a road and its southern boundary being defined by an agricultural field boundary. Its western boundary is undefined.</p> <p>11% of the site is within 20m of a detailed river network.</p> <p>Ecological survey will be needed to determine presence/absence of Great Crested Newts in pools within 500m and presence/absence of priority habitat on site. If either or both are confirmed, the developable area of the site is likely to be significantly reduced to allow for mitigation/enhancement measures. HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites.</p> <p>Potential impact on the setting of Baschurch Centre Conservation Area. The site may also have archaeological potential.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain open countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>A well used public footpath crosses the site, which is considered to be a locally valued green-space. There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP024 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | Milford Road |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | N |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. If the existing 30mph speed limit is extend with appropriate traffic calming and footway provided along site frontage. Vehicle and footway links to BNP008 should be provided on the northern boundary of the site. Potentially 81 homes. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | N |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? | Y. Subject to checks on the suitability of the Milford Road / B5067 junction and the provision of a footway along the northern side of Milford Road between the site and B5067. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network, gun mitigation/enhancement unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision. Suggest seek landscape advice. If GCN are present in the pool and / or the grassland is priority / core habitat, then the reduced area available for development after mitigation/enhancement should be taken into consideration. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Surveys for GCN (in ponds adjacent), Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey). Environmental Network. Ecological connectivity through the site. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Remove area from allocation as will be required to buffer adjacent biodiversity feature |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Link open space to surrounding green corridors to enhance Env. Network. Enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Provide additional pond habitat. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. amphibian friendly gully pots. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impact on setting of Prescott Conservation Area. No known archaeological interest in site itself but medium size suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of CA, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant field and boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is well related to the built form of Baschurch, being located adjacent to an existing development site on the west of the village. Site boundaries are well defined by the development site to the east and agricultural field boundaries to north, west and south.</p> <p>Vehicular access is subject to checks on the suitability of the Milford Road/B5067 junction and the provision of a footway along the northern side of Milford Road between the site and B5067. Ecological survey will be needed to determine presence/absence of Great Crested Newts in pools within 500m and presence/absence of priority habitat on site. If either or both are confirmed, the developable area of the site is likely to be significantly reduced to allow for mitigation/enhancement measures. HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites.</p> <p>Potential impact on the setting of Prescott Conservation Area. The site may also have archaeological potential.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>Yes</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Allocate for residential development</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is well related to the built form and services of Baschurch, being located adjacent to an existing development site on the west of the village.</p> <p>Low density development will minimise any impact on heritage and ecology assets.</p> <p>Development would have good access to services in the village and could offer further opportunity to contribute to the delivery of the medical practice on adjoining land.</p> <p>The site offers the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | <p>35 dwellings</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>Development to use the existing vehicular access through the recently developed site off Shrewsbury Road (14/01123/OUT).</p> <p>Site to be developed at a low density and to include significant open space to reflect the character of its 'edge of village' location.</p> <p>Development to further support the delivery of the medical practice on the adjoining land.</p> <p>Enhancements to the main access junction onto Shrewsbury Road will be sought.</p> <p>It is considered there may be a further opportunity to develop land to the west of this site (not currently available) in order to provide a comprehensive scheme.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP033 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | B5067 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. If the existing 30mph speed limit is extend with appropriate traffic calming and footway provided along site frontage and linking to existing footway leading into village. Potentially 36 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network, gun mitigation/enhancement unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision. Suggest seek landscape advice. If GCN are present in the pool and / or the grassland is priority / core habitat, then the reduced area available for development after mitigation/enhancement should be taken into consideration. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Surveys for GCN (in ponds adjacent), Badgers, nesting birds, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey). Environmental Network |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Remove area from allocation as will be required to buffer adjacent biodiversity feature i.e. pond. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Provide additional pond habitat. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. amphibian friendly gully pots. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site located partially within, and adjacent to the E boundary, of the Prescott Conservation Area, and might impact upon its character and appearance and setting. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance and setting of CA). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to south. Poss. odour from commercial/farming to the north. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Separation to reduce odour issues. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>An n-shaped site located to the south of Baschurch, some distance from the core services and facilities in the settlement. Whilst the site adjoins the built form of the settlement on its western boundary, its eastern portion appears less well related to the built form of the village.</p> <p>HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites. Ecological survey will be needed to determine presence/absence of Great Crested Newts in pools within 500m and presence/absence of priority habitat on site. If either or both are confirmed, the developable area of the site is likely to be significantly reduced to allow for mitigation/enhancement measures. The poor Sustainability Appraisal is due to: the site's location on the best and most versatile agricultural land; its location in a Conservation Area and its proximity to a Listed Building.</p> <p>Site located partially within and adjacent to Prescott Conservation Area.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain open countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The eastern portion of the site is poorly related to the built form of the village.</p> <p>The site is some distance from the core services and facilities in the settlement.</p> <p>The poor Sustainability Appraisal rating, due to: the site's location on the best and most versatile agricultural land; its location in a Conservation Area and its proximity to a Listed Building.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP034a |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Y. If access to the B4397 can be secured through adjacent allocation sites. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. If access to the B4397 can be secured through adjacent allocation sites. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. If access to the B4397 can be secured through adjacent allocation sites. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Consider not allocating this site as within the surface water catchment of Fenemere Ramsar site. Drainage information would be required upfront. The Environmental Network which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. Suggest seek landscape advice and buffer to protect Natural Asset. Consider bat flight paths, connectivity and lighting. landscape advice. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Surveys for Badgers, nesting birds, bats, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey). Environmental Network |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Re-create/restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Provide additional pond habitat. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. amphibian friendly gully pots. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Site located adjacent to the SW boundary of the Baschurch Station Conservation Area and might impact upon its setting. No known archaeological interest in site itself but medium size suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of CA, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>An irregularly shaped site located to the north-east of Baschurch. The site is adjoined by dwellings to north and west, a development site to the south, and an agricultural field to the east - which is currently subject to a Reserved Matters Planning Application.</p> <p>Development will only be possible if vehicular access to the B4397 can be secured through adjacent allocated sites - or potentially the adjacent site currently subject to a Reserved Matters Application, subject to demonstration that an access can be achieved and that it is suitable to serve both the site subject to the Reserved Matters Application and this site.</p> <p>HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites and may show that development is not possible.</p> <p>Potential impact on the setting of Baschurch Centre Conservation Area and may be of archaeological interest.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>Not currently</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain open countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is adjoined by dwellings to north and west, a development site to the south, and an agricultural field to the east - which is currently subject to a Reserved Matters Planning Application. If reserved matters are granted on the adjacent site (and subsequently developed) then this site would be surrounded by development and as such may have potential as a future windfall development location, subject to appropriate changes to the development boundary.</p> <p>Development will only be possible if vehicular access to the B4397 can be secured through adjacent allocated sites - or potentially the adjacent site currently subject to a Reserved Matters Application, subject to demonstration that an access can be achieved and that it is suitable to serve both the site subject to the Reserved Matters Application and this site.</p> <p>As things stand there are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP035 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Via track to B5067 Shrewsbury Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Assumes that there is sufficient land available to provide improved visibility at the junction with the B5067 and to deliver an estate road standard improvement of the track that links this site to the B5067. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Suggest seek landscape advice. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Surveys for Bats, badgers, and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Re-create/restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. Landscape opportunities allow for native species planting. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm. Creating pools, or designing SUDS feature, that are suitable for GCN. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Development might provide an opportunity to conserve and interpret the nearby Grade II listed coffin support (NHLE ref. 1268492) - S106 agreement? |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land woodland to west boundary. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site consists of a small portion of a wider agricultural field, which is well related to the built form of Baschurch with built form to the west and a development site to the south, although site boundaries to north and south are less well defined.</p> <p>The site presents an opportunity to enhance a road infrastructure pinch-point in the town (to the west of the site).</p> <p>HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Development might provide an opportunity to conserve and interpret the nearby Grade II listed coffin support.</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>The site presents an opportunity to enhance a road infrastructure pinch-point in the town (to the west of the site).</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>Yes</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Allocate for residential development</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is well related to the built form of Baschurch, being located adjacent to an existing development site on the west of the village. The site is of an appropriate scale to contribute effectively to meeting the future needs of the village.</p> <p>Low density development will minimise impact on heritage and ecology assets.</p> <p>Opportunity to conserve/enhance the nearby coffin support.</p> <p>Development could contribute to local highway improvements.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | <p>20 dwellings</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>Development to provide for a low density scheme which will include: the delivery of a firm development edge to the eastern part of the site to ensure development is suitably contained; contribution to local highway improvements in order to secure a safe access.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP036 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Via Perryfields to B5067 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Potentially 57 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision. Suggest seek landscape advice. Woodland ecological corridor west of the site contains watercourse. Pond within 500m must be surveyed. Site likely to be used by commuting and foraging bats - mitigation/enhancements likely to be required. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Surveys for GCN (ponds within 500m), Dormice, Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey), reptiles, Otters, Water Voles and White-clawed Crayfish. Environmental Network. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network including watercourse in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. Landscape opportunities allow for native species planting. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm. Creating pools, or designing SUDS feature, that are suitable for GCN. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but medium size suggests site may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land . |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site lies to the south-west of Baschurch adjacent to a development site. However the sites relationship to the built form is limited.</p> <p>HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites. Ecological survey will be required to determine presence or absence of Great Crested Newts and use of site by bats. The poor Sustainability Appraisal is due to: the site's poor access to services and amenities; its location on the best and most versatile agricultural land; its proximity to a Conservation Area and its proximity to a Listed Building.</p> <p>The site may have archaeological potential.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Remain open countryside |
| Reasoning | <p>The sites relationship to the built form of Baschurch is limited, as the site lies to the south of the linear village. The site is also some distance from the core services and facilities in the settlement.</p> <p>The site is also some distance from the core of the village</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP037 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Via Perryfields to B5067 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Potentially 78 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision. Suggest seek landscape advice. Woodland ecological corridor west of the site contains watercourse. Pond within 500m must be surveyed. Site likely to be used by commuting and foraging bats - mitigation/enhancements likely to be required. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Surveys for GCN (ponds within 500m), Dormice, Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey), reptiles, Otters, Water Voles and White-clawed Crayfish. Environmental Network. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network including watercourse in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. Landscape opportunities allow for native species planting. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm. Creating pools, or designing SUDS feature, that are suitable for GCN. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but medium size suggests site may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Baschurch is a very linear settlement (north-south). In order to ensure effective access to services and a cohesive and sustainable settlement the preference is to limit further elongation of the built form through development to the north or south.</p> <p>This is an L-shaped site located to the south of Baschurch. The site abuts a development site to the north north-east, however much of the site is located further south of the existing built form of the village, as such it would further elongate the settlement.</p> <p>HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites. Ecological survey will be required to determine presence or absence of Great Crested Newts and use of site by bats. The poor Sustainability Appraisal is due to: the site's poor access to services and amenities; its location on the best and most versatile agricultural land; its proximity to a Conservation Area and its proximity to a Listed Building.</p> <p>The site may have archaeological interest.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain open countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Baschurch is a very linear settlement (north-south). In order to ensure effective access to services and a cohesive and sustainable settlement the preference is to limit further elongation of the built form through development to the north or south. Much of the site is located further south of the existing built form of the village, as such it would further elongate the settlement.</p> <p>The site is also some distance from the core services and facilities in the settlement.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP037VAR |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Via Perryfields to B5067 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Potentially 53 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Protection of an adjacent pond will reduce the no. of houses possible. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | There is a pond adjacent to the northern boundary. Retention and protection of the pond (with appropriate buffer) will reduce the no. of houses possible. Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. Trees, hedgerows and pond will need to be buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but medium size suggests site may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Tree on adjacent land |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting across the site to link with adjacent pond. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Baschurch is a very linear settlement (north-south). In order to ensure effective access to services and a cohesive and sustainable settlement the preference is to limit further elongation of the built form through development to the north or south.</p> <p>This is an L-shaped site located to the south of Baschurch. The site abuts a development site to the north north-east, however much of the site is located further south of the existing built form of the village, as such it would further elongate the settlement.</p> <p>HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites. Ecological survey will be required to determine presence or absence of Great Crested Newts and use of site by bats. The poor Sustainability Appraisal is due to: the site's poor access to services and amenities; its location on the best and most versatile agricultural land; its proximity to a Conservation Area and its proximity to a Listed Building.</p> <p>The site may have archaeological interest.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | |
| Potential for Windfall? | no |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Remain as Countryside |
| Reasoning | <p>Baschurch is a very linear settlement (north-south). In order to ensure effective access to services and a cohesive and sustainable settlement the preference is to limit further elongation of the built form through development to the north or south. Much of the site is located further south of the existing built form of the village, as such it would further elongate the settlement.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP038 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | B5067 or Perryfield Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Onto B5067 if the existing 30mph speed limit is extend with appropriate traffic calming and footway provided along site frontage and linking to existing footway leading into village. Onto Perryfield Road if the road is improved with footway leading to village and the existing speed limit is extended. Potentially 210 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Suggest seek landscape advice. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Surveys for GCN (in ponds within 500m), Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey). Environmental Network. Ecological connectivity through the site. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Restore Env. Network. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. Landscape opportunities allow for native species planting. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm. Creating pools, or designing SUDS feature, that are suitable for GCN. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Potential impact on setting of Prescott Conservation Area. No known archaeological interest in site itself but large size suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (setting of CA; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to the north boundary of the site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Baschurch is a very linear settlement (north-south). In order to ensure effective access to services and a cohesive and sustainable settlement the preference is to limit further elongation of the built form through development to the north or south. This site is located to the south of Baschurch, some distance from the core services and facilities, as such it would further elongate the settlement. Furthermore whilst it is adjacent to the built form of the settlement to the north-west, much of the site feels poorly related to the built form of the village. Site boundaries are defined by roads to north and west, a field boundary to the east, but are undefined to the south.</p> <p>HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites.</p> <p>The poor Sustainability Appraisal is due to: the site's poor access to services and amenities; its location on the best and most versatile agricultural land; its proximity to a Conservation Area and its proximity to a Listed Building.</p> <p>Potential impact on the setting of Prescott Conservation Area and may be of archaeological interest.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain open countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Baschurch is a very linear settlement (north-south). In order to ensure effective access to services and a cohesive and sustainable settlement the preference is to limit further elongation of the built form through development to the north or south. This site is located to the south of Baschurch, as such it would further elongate the settlement. Furthermore whilst it is adjacent to the built form of the settlement to the north-west, much of the site feels poorly related to the built form of the village.</p> <p>The site is also some distance from the core services and facilities in the settlement.</p> <p>The poor Sustainability Appraisal rating, due to: the site's poor access to services and amenities; its location on the best and most versatile agricultural land; its proximity to a Conservation Area and its proximity to a Listed Building.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP039 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Assumes access can be achieved through Prescott Court |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Given small scale of development - potentially 12 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Suggest seek landscape advice. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Pond within 250m of the development boundary. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement (as required following survey work). Plant hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries to enhance/restore Env. Network. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. Landscape opportunities allow for native species planting. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm. Creating pools, or designing SUDS feature, that are suitable for GCN. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Site located adjacent to the W boundary of the Prescott Conservation Area and might impact upon its setting. However, it is currently occupied by a menage. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (setting of CA). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Development would need to address relationship to the CA. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Redundant equestrian land, some boundary trees. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>A brownfield site located to the west of Baschurch. Site boundaries are defined by property curtilages. Potential impact on the setting of Prescott Conservation Area. HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain open countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP040 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 2% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | B5067 |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | N |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. If the existing 30mph speed limit is extend with appropriate traffic calming and footway provided along site frontage and linking to existing footway leading into village. Potentially 79 homes. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network, gun mitigation/enhancement unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision. Suggest seek landscape advice. If GCN are present in the pool and / or the grassland is priority / core habitat, then the reduced area available for development after mitigation/enhancement should be taken into consideration. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Surveys for GCN (in ponds adjacent), Badgers, nesting birds, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey). Environmental Network |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Remove area from allocation as will be required to buffer adjacent biodiversity feature i.e. pond. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Provide additional pond habitat. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. amphibian friendly gully pots. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Site located partially within, and adjacent to the E boundary, of the Prescott Conservation Area, and might impact upon its character and appearance and setting. No known archaeological interest in site itself but medium size suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance and setting of CA, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road to south. Poss. odour from commercial/farming to the north. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Separation to reduce odour issues. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>An irregularly shaped site located to the south of Baschurch, some distance from the core services and facilities in the settlement. Whilst the site adjoins the built form of the settlement on its western boundary, its eastern portion is poorly related to the built form of the village.</p> <p>HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites. Ecological survey will be needed to determine presence/absence of Great Crested Newts in pools within 500m and presence/absence of priority habitat on site. If either or both are confirmed, the developable area of the site is likely to be significantly reduced to allow for mitigation/enhancement measures.</p> <p>Site located partially within and adjacent to Prescott Conservation Area and may be of archaeological interest.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain open countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The eastern portion of the site is poorly related to the built form of the village. The site is some distance from the core services and facilities in the settlement. There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BNP041 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Y. If access to the B4397 can be secured through adjacent allocation sites. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. If access to the B4397 can be secured through adjacent allocation sites. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. If access to the B4397 can be secured through adjacent allocation sites. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for the following possible effect pathways: impacts from road emissions on Hencott Pool, White Mere and Sweat Mere and Crose Mere Ramsar sites, impact on water catchment of Fenemere. Development may only be possible if foul-water is connected to the sewer and water supply is derived from the regional aquifer, not the surface water catchment. Consider not allocating this site as may be within the surface water catchment of Fenemere Ramsar site. Drainage information would be required upfront. The Environmental Network which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. Suggest seek landscape advice and buffer to protect Natural Asset. Consider bat flight paths, connectivity and lighting. landscape advice. Railway line to the north should be enhanced as ecological corridor - perhaps public open space in this area of the site. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | EclA required. Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants, Environmental Network. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Re-create/restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Link open space to surrounding green corridors to enhance Env. Network. Provide access to green space from surrounding existing housing. Enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Hedgehog friendly developments should include fences / gravel boards with gaps of 13cm by 13cm Bat and bird boxes should be built in to all properties with a mix of species catered for including swift boxes, sparrow terraces etc. Creating pools, or designing SUDS feature, that are suitable for GCN. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impact on setting of Baschurch Station Conservation Area. No known archaeological interest in site itself but medium size suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of CA, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant field and boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>An irregularly shaped site located to the north-east of Baschurch. The site is adjoined by dwellings to north and west, a development site to the south, and an agricultural field to the east - which is currently subject to a Reserved Matters Planning Application.</p> <p>Development will only be possible if vehicular access to the B4397 can be secured through adjacent allocated sites - or potentially the adjacent site currently subject to a Reserved Matters Application, subject to demonstration that an access can be achieved and that it is suitable to serve both the site subject to the Reserved Matters Application and this site.</p> <p>HRA will be required for impacts from road emissions and water use on Ramsar sites and may show that development is not possible.</p> <p>Potential impact on the setting of Baschurch Centre Conservation Area and may be of archaeological interest.</p> <p>The poor Sustainability Appraisal is due to: the site's poor access to services and amenities; its location on the best and most versatile agricultural land; its proximity to a Conservation Area and its proximity to a Listed Building.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>Not currently</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain open countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is adjoined by dwellings to north and west, a development site to the south, and an agricultural field to the east - which is currently subject to a Reserved Matters Planning Application. If reserved matters are granted on the adjacent land (and subsequently developed) then this site would be surrounded by development and as such may have potential as a future windfall development location, subject to appropriate changes to the development boundary.</p> <p>Development will only be possible if vehicular access to the B4397 can be secured through adjacent allocated sites - or potentially the adjacent site currently subject to a Reserved Matters Application, subject to demonstration that an access can be achieved and that it is suitable to serve both the site subject to the Reserved Matters Application and this site.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Community Hub: Bayston Hill

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY005 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Gorse Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes the site will fund a suitable estate road access for potentially 75 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. Subject to a review of the operation of the Gorse Lane Pulley Lane mini roundabout junction. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for NOx pollution from increased road traffic. Also HRA may be needed for recreational impacts in combination on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar sites. More than the minimum 30 square m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) may be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. If species-rich priority grassland is present avoidance measures may reduce the area of the site available to the point where the site is not viable. Therefore application could be refused under MD12. Within Env. Network and so CS17 applies. Housing would reduce/damage the corridor. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Grassland may be core habitat if species-rich. EclA would be required for the grassland, the in-field and boundary trees (5 of which have Tree Preservation Orders). A footpath runs just beyond the northern boundary. The internal hedgerow is core habitat and should be retained. Bats have been recorded roosting in the roof of an adjacent house. They are very likely to use the hedgerow as a navigation route. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Retain the known features like the TPO trees, and the hedgerows. If the grassland has interested unless this is in very small patches it is unlikely that enough mitigation land could be provided while maintaining viability. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site adjacent to an area of early coal mining activity (HER PRN 32632) and may therefore have industrial archaeological interest. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant trees and hedgerows, some subject to Tree Preservation Orders. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints noted |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is adjacent to the built form of the settlement, however it is located within the green gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury. A key local priority is the maintenance of the separate identities of these settlements and the green gap between them.</p> <p>The existing highway would need off site works to serve development of this site, these works are considered achievable subject to a review of the operation of the Gorse Lane - Pulley Lane mini-roundabout.</p> <p>HRA will be required to assess NOx pollution from increased road traffic and potentially cumulative recreational impact on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar Sites.</p> <p>There may be species-rich grassland on the site.</p> <p>The site is located within an environmental network.</p> <p>The internal hedgerow is a core habitat and must be retained.</p> <p>Site may be of archaeological interest.</p> <p>The site contains trees subject to TPO protection.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>The site is adjacent to the built form of the settlement, however it is located within the green gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury. A key local priority is the maintenance of the separate identities of these settlements and the green gap between them.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; offer opportunities for planning gain; and benefit from good access into the highway network.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY011 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Pulley Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes the development will fund suitable estate road access onto pulley lane - possibly mini roundabout serving potentially 114 homes and review of existing speed limit and traffic calming. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for NOx pollution from increased road traffic. Also HRA may be needed for recreational impacts in combination on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar sites. More than the minimum 30 square m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) may be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Large in-field and boundary trees are important in their own right and may support bat roosts and birds nest. The hedgerows around the site are a habitat of principle importance and should be retained where possible. A footpath and small block of woodland lies just to the north of the site. A pond is indicated on OS mapping to the west of the site. Aerial photos suggest this has grown over but this would require an EclA and, if Great Crested Newts are present, could reduce the area available for development to a non-viable level. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Retain the known features like the infield and boundary trees, and the hedgerows. The pond should be restored and a buffer to the development established. If Great Crested Newts are present in the pond it is unlikely that enough mitigation land could be provided while maintaining viability. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The pond could be restored and linked to the large infield free with greenspace |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest on site but medium size suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant boundary trees and hedgerows and occasional field tree. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints noted |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is adjacent to the built form of the settlement, however it is located within the green gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury. A key local priority is the maintenance of the separate identities of these settlements and the green gap between them.</p> <p>HRA will be required to assess NOx pollution from increased road traffic and potentially cumulative recreational impact on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar Sites.</p> <p>Hedgerow boundaries and large trees are a valued habitat.</p> <p>Site may be of archaeological interest.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>The site is adjacent to the built form of the settlement, however it is located within the green gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury. A key local priority is the maintenance of the separate identities of these settlements and the green gap between them.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; offer opportunities for planning gain; and benefit from good access into the highway network.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | BAY026 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 12% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Lythwood Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes the development is able to fund and deliver a new estate road access across land south west of Pinewood onto Lythwood Road opposite 120 Lythwood Road. The track leading to the site from the Glebe Road / Lythwood Road junction is not wide enough to deliver an estate road access for 83 homes and cannot be improved without third party land. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for NOx pollution from increased road traffic. Also HRA may be needed for recreational impacts in combination on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar sites. More than the minimum 30 square m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) may be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Footpath runs along top boundary. Hedgerows and mature trees are present alongside the northern west and north east boundaries. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | EclIA require of boundary trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The environmental network and public access could be improved with a corridor along the south western boundary and / or the north eastern boundary |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest on site but medium size suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant boundary trees on or adjacent to north east boundary and boundary hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints noted |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is well related to the built form of the settlement, with dwellings to the north, east and west. However the sites southern boundary is poorly defined.</p> <p>2% of the site is located within the 1 in 100 year surface flood zone and 12% within the 1 in 1,000 year surface flood zone. 2% of the site is also within 20m of an historic flood event.</p> <p>The site is located within a landscape sensitivity parcel which is considered to have a medium-high visual sensitivity. HRA will be required to assess NOx pollution from increased road traffic and potentially cumulative recreational impact on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar Sites.</p> <p>Site may be of archaeological interest.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>The site is well related to the built form of the settlement, with dwellings to the north, east and west. However the sites southern boundary is poorly defined.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; offer opportunities for planning gain; and benefit from good access into the highway network.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY038 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 4% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low and Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | High and Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | A49 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes site would fund a major access onto the A49. Highways England may require this to be a modification of the Condover junction. Potentially 730 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | N. The development can not deliver an attractive direct pedestrian / cycle route into Baytown Hill from the site. The site is detached from Bayston Hill and the facilities and without good pedestrian links would create otherwise avoidable vehicular trips on the Strategic Road Network. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for NOx pollution from increased road traffic. Also HRA may be needed for recreational impacts in-combination on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar sites. More than the minimum 30 square m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) may be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. This development would significantly impact an iconic Shropshire vista that inspired the writings of the writer Mary Webb. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Two large in-field trees are present and large trees are present along the eastern boundary. A footpath cuts across the southern corner. The railway line running along the eastern boundary currently acts as an environmental corridor with the field margin also adding to this. The upper reaches of the Money Brook runs along the northern boundary. Reptiles are known to use the railway as a corridor and may also use the margins of this site to forage. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | An EclA is require for the trees and hedgerows in particular. Reptile survey mats on the eastern border may be required. The Eastern and Northern boundaries should have a 10m buffer at least. A landscape assessment should be carried out with particular reference to the well known and culturally significant (Mary Webb) view from Lyth Hill. Green space should seek to link with the pockets of habitat found in the golf course to the south. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The eastern side of the northern end of the side was, until recently, a low lying wet hollow which would flood and supported ground nesting birds. There is an opportunity to re-instate this as the peat soils are likely to still be present. This area would be liable flooding anyway and restoring to wetland would fit in with the need to buffer the watercourse on the northern boundary. The hedgerow alongside the A49 has been in poor condition for many years. Any development should seek to restore this priority habitat and corridor. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> Significant Constraints: | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | potential negative affect on setting of Scheduled Monument of The Burgs hillfort (NHLE ref. 1003016).No known archaeological interest on site but large size suggests it may have some potential. Site detached from any settlement and likely to have detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding rural landscape. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of SM; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> Significant Constraints: | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant boundary trees and hedgerows and occasional field tree. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> Significant Constraints: | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road to west and rail to east. Kennels to the south east of the site creating noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> Management of Constraints: | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings, barrier treatment. and combinations thereof to mitigate for road noise and rail noise. Suggest no development in the south east area where dog barking may be audible from existing kennels business. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is very large, linear and rural in character. It also poorly relates to the built form of the settlement. 1% of the site is located in the 1 in 30 year surface flood zone, 2% within the 1 in 100 year surface flood zone and 12% within the 1 in 1,000 year surface flood zone.</p> <p>3% of the site is also within 20m of an historic flood event and 4% within 20m of a detailed river network.</p> <p>The majority of site (excluding a very small area at its very southern extent) is located within a landscape sensitivity parcel which is considered to have medium-low landscape sensitivity and high visual sensitivity.</p> <p>The site is detached from Bayston Hill and the facilities and services it offers. The existing highway would need off site works to serve development of this site, but these works are not considered achievable as the development cannot deliver an attractive direct pedestrian/cycle route into the town, without these improvements development of this site would create unavoidable vehicular trips on the strategic road network.</p> <p>HRA will be required to assess NOx pollution from increased road traffic and potentially cumulative recreational impact on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar Sites.</p> <p>Development would impact on the Shropshire Vista which inspired the writings of Mary Webb.</p> <p>The railway line and associated buffer on the sites eastern boundary act as a wildlife corridor.</p> <p>The site performs poorly within Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Development may impact on the Burgs Hillfort Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>Site may be of archaeological interest.</p> <p>Roads to the west and east of the site and kennels to the south may be a source of noise.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Reasoning</p> | <p>The site is very large, linear and rural in character. It also poorly relates to the built form of the settlement.</p> <p>The majority of site (excluding a very small area at its very southern extent) is located within a landscape sensitivity parcel which is considered to have medium-low landscape sensitivity and high visual sensitivity.</p> <p>Development would impact on the Shropshire Vista which inspired the writings of Mary Webb.</p> <p>Development may impact on the Burgs Hillfort Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>The site is detached from Bayston Hill and the facilities and services it offers. The existing highway would need off site works to serve development of this site, but these works are not considered achievable as the development cannot deliver an attractive direct pedestrian/cycle route into the town, without these improvements development of this site would create unavoidable vehicular trips on the strategic road network.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; offer opportunities for planning gain; and benefit from good access into the highway network.</p> |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</p> | |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</p> | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY039 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 12% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium and Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High and High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Lyth Hill Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund new estate road access which ideally incorporates / replaces Beddoes Drive, a footway along site frontage and a review of traffic speeds along Lyth Hill Road and fund any necessary interventions. Potentially 182 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Assumes development will fund footway link along Lyth Hill Road (west side) between site and Grove Lane. Deliverable within highway land. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for NOx pollution from increased road traffic. Also HRA may be needed for recreational impacts in combination on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar sites. More than the minimum 30 square m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) may be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Full EclA would be required. Significant boundary and in-field trees are present plus two hedgerows (that are priority habitat in their own right) and areas of grassland and scrub that could hold interest and support protected species. Use of part of the site by Lizards is likely as they have been found in neighbouring gardens. The small block of trees in the field may well be an old pond. A small watercourse runs along the northern boundary but appears to be culverted under some of the northern part of the site. This would require a buffer and ideally sections de-culverting. The water course and its buffer is protected under MD12 and CS17 and this may impact the number of area of development possible at this site. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | The areas currently under arable could provide reasonable numbers of houses but the more natural areas should be retained. In particular the boundary between the two main fields. And the boundary hedgerows. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The footpath just beyond the northern boundary could be improved by designing green space here. This could also serve as the buffer to the watercourse. The watercourse should be de-culverted. A good buffer to the houses to the north east would help retain habitat for lizards provided open habitat with varied topography is designed in. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest on site but large size suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). NB DBA and geophysical survey completed in 2015 |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with very significant boundary and hedgerow trees and tree groups and hedgerows and occasional field tree and tree groups. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints noted |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is well related to the built form of the settlement, with dwellings to the north. It also benefits from well defined hedgerow field boundaries.</p> <p>1% of the site is within 20m of an historic flood event and 12% within 20m of a detailed river network.</p> <p>The majority of site (excluding a very small area at its very eastern extent) is located within a landscape sensitivity parcel which is considered to have medium landscape sensitivity and medium-high visual sensitivity.</p> <p>HRA will be required to assess NOx pollution from increased road traffic and potentially cumulative recreational impact on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar Sites.</p> <p>Hedgerows, mature trees, areas of grass/scrubland could support protected species.</p> <p>Site may be of archaeological interest.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | The watercourse should be buffered and there is an opportunity to de-culvert it. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Allocate for residential development. |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Reasoning</p> | <p>The site is well related to the built form of the settlement, with dwellings to the north. It also benefits from well defined hedgerow field boundaries.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to provide an area of high quality open space on the site in an area of the village with limited provision.</p> <p>Hedgerows, mature trees, areas of grass/scrubland could support protected species, these should be retained on the site.</p> |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</p> | <p>100 dwellings</p> |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</p> | <p>The development will incorporate an appropriate access and make any necessary improvements to the wider highway network.</p> <p>A review of traffic speeds along Lyth Hill Road will be undertaken and any necessary interventions implemented.</p> <p>A footpath will be provided along the sites eastern road frontage and continue up to Grove Lane.</p> <p>Strong and significant natural site boundaries will be provided and green infrastructure corridors, including effective native planting, will form an intrinsic component of this development. The watercourse running along the sites northern boundary will be appropriately buffered and form a green infrastructure east-west corridor. The main hedgerow within the site will form the focus for a north-south green infrastructure corridor.</p> <p>Trees and hedgerows on the site will be retained and enhanced and if possible, the watercourse will be de-culverted.</p> <p>A central green space/pocket park suitable for recreational use by residents and connected to the green links will be provided.</p> <p>The site will incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage and attenuation ponds, informed by a sustainable drainage strategy. Any residual surface water flood risk will be managed by excluding development from the affected areas of the site, which will form part of the Green Infrastructure network. Flood and water management measures must not displace water elsewhere.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | BAY040 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 4% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | A49 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes site would fund a major access onto the A49. Highways England may require this to be a modification of the Condover junction. Potentially 524 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | N. Unless the development can secure an attractive direct pedestrian / cycle route into Bayston Hill from the western boundary of the site. The site is effectively detached from Bayston Hill and the facilities and without good pedestrian links would create otherwise avoidable vehicular trips on the Strategic Road Network. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for NOx pollution from increased road traffic. Also HRA may be needed for recreational impacts in combination on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar sites. More than the minimum 30 square m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) may be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Full EclA would be required. A steeper ridge with unfarmed vegetation would need a detailed look. Protected species like lizards are likely here. This links to a small field to the west of the area which could be priority grassland. Mature trees and the hedgerows are of interest. Most of the site is arable land and of low biodiversity interest. The site would have significant landscape impact and should be assessed for this. Two footpaths are present in this area. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Steeper areas with more natural vegetation should be retained but should not be counted as 'accessible greenspace' due being so steep. Hedgerows should be planted along the A49. Small field of pasture may need to be retained if survey shows it to be priority habitat (core habitat) |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The natural lie of the land could be followed to create a green corridor from the steeper bank through to the northern end. Enhancements could be made to the management of the steeper area. This could be retaining as short vegetation or perhaps planting with trees as a screen. Ecology survey to advise. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Potential negative affect on setting of Scheduled Monument of The Burgs hillfort (NHLE ref. 1003016). Site includes cropmark enclosure of a double ditched rectilinear cropmark enclosure site (HER PRN 31491) of likely later prehistoric or Roman date. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of SM, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant boundary trees and tree groups and hedgerows and occasional field tree and tree group. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to the east creating noise. Air quality near to the road may require assessment unless residential facades are set well back from the road (suggest at least 10m). |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings, barrier treatment. and combinations thereof to mitigate for road noise and rail noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is very large. The northern element of the site is relatively well related to the built form of the settlement, with dwellings to the north and west. However due to the point of access, connectivity between the site and the surrounding built form would be very limited. The central and southern elements of the site are more sprawling and have a lesser relationship to the existing built form of the settlement and also have limited connectivity.</p> <p>4% of the site is within 20m of a detailed river network.</p> <p>The site is located within a landscape sensitivity parcel which is considered to have high visual sensitivity.</p> <p>The site is detached from Bayston Hill and the facilities and services it offers. The existing highway would need off site works to serve development of this site, but these works are not considered achievable as the development cannot deliver an attractive direct pedestrian/cycle route into the town, without these improvements development of this site would create unavoidable vehicular trips on the strategic road network.</p> <p>HRA will be required to assess NOx pollution from increased road traffic and potentially cumulative recreational impact on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar Sites.</p> <p>The steeper ridge on the site may be a habitat for lizards.</p> <p>Development may impact on the Burgs Hillfort Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>Site may be of archaeological interest.</p> <p>Road to east could be a source of noise.</p> <p>Air quality near to road will require due consideration.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Reasoning</p> | <p>The site is very large. The northern element of the site is relatively well related to the built form of the settlement, with dwellings to the north and west. However due to the point of access, connectivity between the site and the surrounding built form would be very limited. The central and southern elements of the site are more sprawling and have a lesser relationship to the existing built form of the settlement and also have limited connectivity.</p> <p>The site is located within a landscape sensitivity parcel which is considered to have high visual sensitivity.</p> <p>The site is detached from Bayston Hill and the facilities and services it offers. The existing highway would need off site works to serve development of this site, but these works are not considered achievable as the development cannot deliver an attractive direct pedestrian/cycle route into the town, without these improvements development of this site would create unavoidable vehicular trips on the strategic road network.</p> <p>The steeper ridge on the site may be a habitat for lizards.</p> <p>Development may impact on the Burgs Hillfort Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; offer opportunities for planning gain; and benefit from good access into the highway network.</p> |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</p> | |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</p> | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY042 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 9% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 21% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High and Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Jarvis Drive - continuation of |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes the site will fund a suitable estate road extending from Jarvis Drive for potentially 33 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Assumes pedestrian link to Parrs Lane is retained. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for NOx pollution from increased road traffic. Also HRA may be needed for recreational impacts in combination on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar sites. More than the minimum 30 square m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) may be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Full EclA would be required. The Environmental Network runs within the site along the eastern border where a small watercourse runs from the pool just south of the site. This, and another pool are likely to be Core Habitat in addition to the woodland surrounding them. A footpath crosses the site to the north. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | EclA required to assess the water course to the east of the site and the mature trees and hedgerows on the borders. A significant buffer should be present alongside the eastern boundary that might impact on the number of properties possible on the site. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | The corridor to the east of the site could also be used to improve public access to the community greenspace to the south and enhance the biodiversity of the network. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site adjacent to an area of early coal mining activity (HER PRN 06836) and may therefore have industrial archaeological interest. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant area of woodland adjacent to the south boundary, significant trees and tree groups adjacent to east boundary. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Unknown filled ground to the south creating potential contaminated land. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Con land mitigation likely to be available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site lies adjacent to and is relatively well related to the built form of the settlement, with dwellings to north and east. However the sites western boundary is poorly defined.</p> <p>9% of the site is located in the 1 in 1,000 year surface flood zone.</p> <p>21% of the site is within 20m of a detailed river network.</p> <p>Part of the site is within an environmental network.</p> <p>A pool on the site and associated woodland may be priority habitat.</p> <p>The majority of the site (excluding a very small area at its very southern extent) is located within a landscape sensitivity parcel which is considered to have medium-high visual sensitivity.</p> <p>HRA will be required to assess NOx pollution from increased road traffic and potentially cumulative recreational impact on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar Sites.</p> <p>Site may be of archaeological interest.</p> <p>The site may include contaminated land.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>The site lies adjacent to and is relatively well related to the built form of the settlement, with dwellings to north and east. However the sites western boundary is poorly defined.</p> <p>The site lies adjacent to and is relatively well related to the built form of the settlement, with dwellings to north and east. However the sites western boundary is poorly defined.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; offer opportunities for planning gain; and benefit from good access into the highway network.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY043 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 2% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Gorse Lane - continuation of |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes the site will fund a suitable estate road extending from Gorse Lane for potentially 147 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. Subject to a review of the operation of the Gorse Lane Pulley Lane mini roundabout junction. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for NOx pollution from increased road traffic. Also HRA may be needed for recreational impacts in combination on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar sites. More than the minimum 30 square m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) may be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Full EClA would be required. Woodland area and two individual trees in the southern corner are protected under TPO. Woodland edge to west provides a significant area of core habitat and corridor. Rea Brook to the north acts as a corridor and core habitat under MD12 and CS17. A locally significant species of fly has been recorded to the north of this area. Probably alongside the riverside footpath. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | A buffer to the woodland edge and the river should be established to retain and enhance the environmental corridor. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Better connectivity could be created by boosting the woodland to the west and an enhanced path alongside the river could be planned in. A hedgerow or thin woodland should be created along the eastern boundary to improve connectivity to the river |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site includes to an area of early coal mining activity (HER PRN 32632) and therefore has industrial archaeological interest. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Areas of woodland along part of the boundaries of the site, hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to the north may impact on the north of the site thorough noise. As a result a noise assessment may be required. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings, barrier treatment. and combinations thereof to mitigate for road noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is very large. Whilst its southern boundary is adjacent to the built form of the settlement, this element of Bayston Hill is relatively linear and as such the sites setting is very rural. Additionally, the sites eastern boundary is poorly defined. Furthermore it is located within the green gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury. A key local priority is the maintenance of the separate identities of these settlements and the green gap between them.</p> <p>2% of the site is within 20m of a detailed river network.</p> <p>The existing highway would need off site works to serve development of this site, these works are considered achievable subject to a review of the operation of the Gorse Lane - Pulley Lane mini-roundabout.</p> <p>Woodland to the west of the site provides a core habitat/corridor, as does the Rea Brook to the north.</p> <p>HRA will be required to assess NOx pollution from increased road traffic and potentially cumulative recreational impact on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar Sites.</p> <p>Site may be of archaeological interest.</p> <p>The site performs poorly within Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Road to the north of the site may be a source of noise.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>The site is very large. Whilst its southern boundary is adjacent to the built form of the settlement, this element of Bayston Hill is relatively linear and as such the sites setting is very rural. Additionally, the sites eastern boundary is poorly defined. Furthermore it is located within the green gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury. A key local priority is the maintenance of the separate identities of these settlements and the green gap between them.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; offer opportunities for planning gain; and benefit from good access into the highway network.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY048 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Lyth Hill Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund new estate road access, possibly linked to BAY039, pedestrian crossing facility to west side of Lyth Hill Road and a review of traffic speeds along Lyth Hill Road and fund any necessary interventions. Potentially 93 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Assumes development will fund footway link along Lyth Hill Road (west side) between site and Grove Lane. Deliverable within highway land. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for NOx pollution from increased road traffic. Also HRA may be needed for recreational impacts in combination on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar sites. More than the minimum 30 square m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) may be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. Grassland may also be of high quality and if so would be classed as core habitat. Therefore application could be refused under MD12 and would be within Env. Network and so CS17 applies. Housing would reduce/damage the corridor. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | At over 2ha of permanent pasture this site would require an Environmental Impact Assessment through Natural England. The watercourse alongside the southern boundary will need a significant buffer which would impact the number of houses being built. Buildings, trees and the hedgerows may support bats and birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | EclA required to assess the water course to the south of the site, the mature trees and hedgerows on the borders, and any buildings that would be removed or modified. A significant buffer should be present alongside the southern boundary that might impact on the number of properties possible on the site. Lizards have been recorded in gardens in the area and should be surveyed for in this area to ensure compliance with the Wildlife & Countryside Act. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Opportunities should be sought to improve the watercourse alongside the southern boundary for wildlife and for it's ability to hold back water and clean it. Small woody debris dams would serve this function. The band of woodland to the south east could be enhanced by additional woodland planting along that border. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site includes post medieval house, White House, which is considered a non-designated heritage asset (HER PRN 15286). No known archaeological interest on site but medium size suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (Level 2 historic building assessment if demo of White House proposed; archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | White House should be retained and appropriately integrated into any development proposal |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant boundary trees and tree groups and hedgerows particularly on south boundary and occasional field tree and tree group. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to the west. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings, barrier treatment. and combinations thereof to mitigate for road noise |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is separated from the built form of the settlement by other land. As such it feels very rural in character. 1% of the site is located in the 1 in 30 year surface flood zone, 2% within the 1 in 100 year surface flood zone and 6% within the 1 in 1,000 year surface flood zone.</p> <p>The site is located within a landscape sensitivity parcel which is considered to have high visual sensitivity. HRA will be required to assess NOx pollution from increased road traffic and potentially cumulative recreational impact on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar Sites.</p> <p>Grassland may be a core habitat.</p> <p>The site is located within an environmental network.</p> <p>Watercourse along the sites southern boundary would need to be buffered.</p> <p>May be protected species on the site.</p> <p>The post-medieval White House located on the site is considered a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>Site may be of archaeological interest.</p> <p>Road to the west of the site may be a source of noise.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>The site is separated from the built form of the settlement by other land. As such it feels very rural in character.</p> <p>The site is located within a landscape sensitivity parcel which is considered to have high visual sensitivity.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; offer opportunities for planning gain; and benefit from good access into the highway network.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BAY048VAR |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Lyth Hill Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund new estate road access and a review of traffic speeds along Lyth Hill Road and fund any necessary interventions. Potentially 19 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Assumes development will fund short footway link along Lyth Hill Road (east or west side) from site to existing footway. Deliverable within highway land. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for NOx pollution from increased road traffic. Also HRA may be needed for recreational impacts in combination on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar sites. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Trees and hedgerows will need to be buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site now excludes the White House itself. Total site area now substantially reduced to archaeological potential considered to be much lower. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Well established trees on boundary and within the site, hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Tree planting across the site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to the west. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings, barrier treatment. and combinations thereof to mitigate for road noise |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Relatively small site, separated from the built form of the settlement by other land.</p> <p>The site is located within a landscape sensitivity parcel which is considered to have high visual sensitivity.</p> <p>HRA will be required to assess NOx pollution from increased road traffic and potentially cumulative recreational impact on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar Sites.</p> <p>May be protected specifics on the site.</p> <p>Road to the west of the site may be a source of noise.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>Relatively small site, separated from the built form of the settlement by other land.</p> <p>The site is located within a landscape sensitivity parcel which is considered to have high visual sensitivity.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; offer opportunities for planning gain; and benefit from good access into the highway network.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | BAY050 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 12% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Not Assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Not Assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Glebe Road & Eric Lock Road West |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund new estate road access onto Glebe Road for potentially 93 homes. Site layout should accommodate pedestrian and cycle access onto Eric Lock Road West and Lyth Hill Road. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | If priority habitats are present, this area should not be developed. HRA will be required for NOx pollution from increased road traffic. Also HRA may be needed for recreational impacts in combination on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar sites. More than the minimum 30 square m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) may be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | The site may contain priority grassland habitat - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then this area of the site should not be developed. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats (buildings and trees), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. There are TPO'd trees on the site. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | If priority habitat, those areas should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Potential road noise to the boundary of the site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is located within the existing built form of the settlement.</p> <p>The site contains an area of identified open space - specifically the former schools playing field. However the school was considered to be surplus to requirements and there is potential for better open space provision on the site through its development.</p> <p>Development of the site would be supported by an assessment which clearly indicates that the open space or facility is surplus to requirements or the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision.</p> <p>HRA will be required to assess NOx pollution from increased road traffic and potentially cumulative recreational impact on Bomere, Shomere and Betton Pools and Berrington Pool Ramsar Sites.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Allocate for residential development. |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Reasoning</p> | <p>The site is located within the existing built form of the settlement.</p> <p>The site contains an area of identified open space - specifically the former schools playing field. However the school was considered to be surplus to requirements and there is potential for better open space provision on the site through its development.</p> <p>Development of the site would be supported by an assessment which clearly indicates that the open space or facility is surplus to requirements or the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision.</p> <p>The site offers the opportunity for planning gain through the formation of a community hub and new parking provision.</p> |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</p> | <p>47 dwellings</p> |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</p> | <p>A significant area of open space will form the focus for the development.</p> <p>Existing open space will be assessed and if this is not surplus to requirements any loss will be offset by equivalent or better provision on or off site.</p> <p>A Community Hub will be provided.</p> <p>Appropriate parking will be provided to serve the church and new Community Hub.</p> <p>Existing trees and hedgerows will be retained and enhanced. Appropriate tree planting will occur on the site and particularly on areas of open space.</p> <p>The site will incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage, informed by a sustainable drainage strategy. Any residual surface water flood risk will be managed by excluding development from the affected areas of the site, which will form part of the Green Infrastructure network. Flood and water management measures must not displace water elsewhere.</p> |

Community Hub: Bicton

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | BIT001 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Bicton Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. If the development delivered improvements along the site frontage on Bicton Lane. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | N. Potentially 62 homes and Bicton Lane south of the site is narrow there is limited scope for widening or provision of a footway. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in combination) of Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered field and boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Poultry units on site currently may have created contamination on site. Looks to be a motocross course to the west which may create noise. Agricultural holding to the southeast and east which may create odour and noise and dust. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Con land remediation likely to be available. Separation to keep away from agricultural dust and odour sources. Glazing and barrier protection to deal with motocross noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site consists of a series of large poultry sheds and their curtilage. The site is located to the north of the village, associated with ribbon/dispersed development rather than the core of the villages and the services available within it.</p> <p>The site has medium-high visual sensitivity to residential development.</p> <p>Vehicular access is not achievable because Bicton Lane south of the site is too narrow and there is limited scope for widening or provision of a footway.</p> <p>HRA will be needed for impact of emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site. the site may contain contaminated land.</p> <p>The site's poor Sustainability Appraisal rating is due to: its proximity to Ancient Woodland; its poor access to services and amenities; its location on the best and most versatile agricultural land; its location within a groundwater Source Protection Zone and its proximity to a Listed Building.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Retain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is located to the north of the village, associated with ribbon/dispersed development rather than the core of the villages and the services available within it. As such it is some distance from the services and facilities available within the village and there are considered to be more sustainable options available for development.</p> <p>Vehicular access is not achievable because Bicton Lane south of the site is too narrow and there is limited scope for widening or provision of a footway.</p> <p>There is a preferable site available within the settlement.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | BIT006 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 17% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 27% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | B4380 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Assumes a review and extension of existing speed limit with appropriate traffic calming. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. The B4380 at this location still has the appearance of a high speed inter urban main road. Significant changes to the appearance of the section of B4380 between Bicton Village and Shrewsbury will be necessary before this and a number of other sites along the B4380 are developed. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be needed for traffic impacts on a Ramsar site |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | The majority of the site is TPO'd. The eastern hedgerow/ditch forms an Env. Network corridor and should be protected and appropriately buffered. May require botanical survey. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, water voles, otters, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Cropmark archaeological site in near vicinity, so may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant field and boundary trees and hedgerows. TPO on site. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road to south creating noise source. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site consists of a small agricultural field with significant field and boundary trees and hedgerows. These trees and hedgerows define the extent of the site. The site has medium-high visual sensitivity to residential development. Vehicular access is subject to significant changes to the appearance of the section of B4380 between Bicton Village and Shrewsbury before this and a number of other sites along the B4380 could be developed. HRA will be needed for impact of emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site. The site may have archaeological potential.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Retain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Whilst the site is relatively free of major constraints, it is recognised that the visual sensitivity of the site is medium/high, largely a reflection of its edge of village location. In light of the identified requirement for the village, it is considered there is a preferable site available within the settlement.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | BIT013 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 1% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Bicton Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Provided development funds appropriate improvements along Bicton Lane (along site frontage - widening and footway provision - which should be deliverable within highway land and the site. Potentially 75 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. Provided the development funds appropriate improvements along Bicton Lane (south of the site frontage) - widening and footway provision - which should be deliverable within highway land. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Reduction in developable area due to presence of GCNs and woodland/Env. Network. Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) of Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Parts of the site are TPO'd. The site is within the Env. Network. GCNs have been recorded in one of the on-site ponds. A min. 50m buffer will be required around the ponds, without public access. The woodland/scrub will have to be retained and appropriately buffered. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, water voles, otters, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Potential impact on setting of Grade II listed Holy Trinity Church (NHLE ref. 1055149). Site includes part of the former park like grounds associated with Bicton Hall (HER PRN 13220). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of LB, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | High design standard required in this sensitive location. Potential for S106 monies to provide for the conservation of the ruins and churchyard of Holy Trinity Church. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Park land with significant field and boundary trees, woodlands and hedgerows. TPOs on and / or adjacent to the site. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No sig constraints. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>An irregularly shaped site consisting of two agricultural fields (divided by an access road running diagonally through the site from north west to south east); areas of dense woodland and a small agricultural barn. Site boundaries are defined by roads and field boundaries.</p> <p>The site is located to the north of the village, associated with ribbon/dispersed development rather than the core of the villages and the services available within it.</p> <p>The site has medium-high visual sensitivity to residential development.</p> <p>Vehicular access is subject to development funding appropriate improvements (widening and footway provision) along Bicton Lane south of the site frontage: these should be deliverable within highway land.</p> <p>HRA will be needed for impact of emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site.</p> <p>The developable area of the site will be reduced due to the presence of Great Crested Newts and the site's location within an Environmental Network.</p> <p>Possible impact on listed buildings.</p> <p>The site contains part of the former park like grounds associated with Bicton Hall.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Retain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is located to the north of the village, associated with ribbon/dispersed development rather than the core of the villages and the services available within it. As such it is some distance from the services and facilities available within the village and there are considered to be more sustainable options available for development.</p> <p>The developable area of the site will be reduced due to the presence of Great Crested Newts and the site's location within an Environmental Network.</p> <p>The site contains part of the former park like grounds associated with Bicton Hall.</p> <p>There is a preferable site available within the settlement.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | BIT015 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Bicton Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. If development is limited in scale and similar to existing. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. If development is limited in scale and similar to existing. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in combination) of Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impacts on the setting of Grade II listed Bicton Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1055186) and White House (NHLE ref. 1055185) |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of LBs). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Sensitive redevelopment of site utilising high quality design could enhance the setting of the LBs and character and appearance of the settlement of as a whole. Potential for S106 monies to provide for the conservation of the ruins and churchyard of Holy Trinity Church. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Some trees on or adjacent to the site. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural use currently which may have created land contamination. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Remediation likely to be available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site contains a series of agricultural buildings and their curtilage. The site is located to the north of the village, associated with ribbon/dispersed development rather than the core of the villages and the services available within it.</p> <p>The site has medium-high visual sensitivity to residential development. Vehicular access is subject to development being limited in scale and similar to existing development.</p> <p>HRA will be needed for impact of emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site. Possible impact on listed buildings.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Retain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is located to the north of the village, associated with ribbon/dispersed development rather than the core of the villages and the services available within it. As such it is some distance from the services and facilities available within the village and there are considered to be more sustainable options available for development.</p> <p>Vehicular access is subject to development being limited in scale and similar to existing development.</p> <p>There is a preferable site available within the settlement.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | BIT020 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Shepherd's Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assuming only two or three properties are developed on this very small site |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Assuming only two or three properties are developed on this very small site |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | If priority habitats are present, development is not recommended. Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) of Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. Requires botanical survey, ECLA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | If priority habitat, site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Few boundary trees. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road to the north and vehicle noise possible to the west (car park area). |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site consists of a small area of scrubland within the village of Four Crosses. The site is bordered by a public house to north (beyond the B4380), dwellings to east and south and a car park associated with the Brethren's meeting room to the west. Ecological survey will be needed to determine presence/absence of priority habitat. if present, development would be contrary to current Local Plan policy MD12. The site's poor Sustainability Appraisal rating is due to: its proximity to a Wildlife Site; its poor access to services and amenities; its location on the best and most versatile agricultural land; its location within a groundwater Source Protection Zone and its proximity to a Listed Building. HRA will be needed for impact of emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>Yes</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Retain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site consists of a small area of scrubland within the village of Four Crosses. The site is bordered by a public house to north (beyond the B4380), dwellings to east and south and a car park associated with the Brethren's meeting room to the west. Due to the sites location it is more closely associated with the built form of Four Crosses than Bicton. There is a preferable site available within the settlement.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | BIT021 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 25% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Bicton Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Assumes new footway will be provided within frontage of development and within highway to primary school entrance. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in combination) of Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | The north-western hedgerow/ditch forms an Env. Network corridor and should be protected and appropriately buffered. May require botanical survey. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, water voles, otters, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Potential impact on setting of Grade II listed Holy Trinity Church (NHLE ref. 1055149). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of LB). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with boundary trees and hedgerows. TPO on or adjacent to site. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to east. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site consists of an irregularly shaped agricultural field located to the west of Bicton.</p> <p>The site has medium-high visual sensitivity to residential development.</p> <p>HRA will be needed for impact of emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site.</p> <p>Possible impact on listed buildings.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Retain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Visual impact is considered to be of a medium/high sensitivity, and there is some concern over the impact on the setting of the Grade II listed Holy Trinity Church.</p> <p>Within the context of the proposed requirement for the village to 2036 there is considered to be a preferable site available within the settlement.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | <p>15 dwellings</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>Development to be accessed from the B4380. Local highway improvements will be required to support development, including the relocation of 30mph zone other and traffic calming measures.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | BIT022 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | B4380 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Assumes a review and extension of existing speed limit with appropriate traffic calming. A pedestrian link to Woodside should be secured to improve accessibility for pedestrian to the village facilities. Potentially 186 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. The B4380 at this location still has the appearance of a high speed inter urban main road. Significant changes to the appearance of the section of B4380 between Bicton Village and Shrewsbury will be necessary before this and a number of other sites along the B4380 are developed. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in combination) of Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | A PROW runs along the western boundary. The trees and hedgerows should be retained and adequately buffered. May require botanical survey. Requires ECLA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impact on the setting of Grade II* listed Bicton Grove Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1366919). No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of LB, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant field and boundary trees and hedgerows. TPO on or adjacent to site. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road to the south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site consists of two agricultural fields located to the east of Bicton fronting onto the B4380. Site boundaries are defined by the D4380 to the south, property curtilages to east and west and field boundaries to the north. The site is well related to the built form of the settlement.</p> <p>Vehicular access is subject to significant changes to the appearance of the section of B4380 between Bicton Village and Shrewsbury before this and a number of other sites along the B4380 could be developed. HRA will be needed for impact of emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site.</p> <p>Possible impact on listed buildings.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>Yes</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Allocate for residential development</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>This site is considered to have strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; benefit from well defined site boundaries; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> <p>The site offers the opportunity to improve a stretch of the B4380 in order to facilitate development.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | BIT023 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 98% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 27% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Bicton Lane and Brookside |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Provided development funds appropriate improvements along Bicton Lane (along site frontage - widening and footway provision - which should be deliverable within highway land and the site. Potentially 71 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. Provided the development funds appropriate improvements along Bicton Lane (south of the site frontage) - widening and footway provision - which should be deliverable within highway land. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in combination) of Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | A PROW runs along the northern boundary. There is an area of TPO'd trees on the site. The central hedgerow/ditch forms an Env. Network corridor and should be protected and appropriately buffered. May require botanical survey. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, water voles, otters, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Potential impact on setting of Grade II listed Holy Trinity Church (NHLE ref. 1055149). Part of site includes and area of earthwork remains of ridge and furrow (HER PRN 34298). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of LB, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant field and boundary trees and hedgerows. TPO woodland on south boundary, TPOs on site. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No significant constraints. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>A large and irregularly shaped site consisting of parts of two agricultural fields. site boundaries are in part defined by a combination of property curtilages, the road, field boundaries, however parts of the sites boundaries are undefined, crossing through agricultural fields.</p> <p>The site has medium-high visual sensitivity to residential development.</p> <p>Vehicular access is subject to development funding appropriate improvements (widening and footway provision) along Bicton Lane south of the site frontage: these should be deliverable within highway land.</p> <p>HRA will be needed for impact of emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Retain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is considered to have a medium/high sensitivity to visual impact. Within the context of the proposed requirement for the village to 2036 there is considered to be a preferable site available within the settlement.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | BIT024 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Bicton Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. If the development delivered improvements along the site frontage on Bicton Lane. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | N. Potentially 28 homes and Bicton Lane south of the site is narrow there is limited scope for widening or provision of a footway. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in combination) of Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. A PROW runs along the southern boundary |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Potential impact on the setting of Grade II listed Woodlands Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1295690). Site includes an area of residual earthwork remains of ridge and furrow (HER PRN 34298). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of LB, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with boundary hedgerows. Some trees in adjacent land. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | Poultry units to north creating noise, odour, dusts that are not considered appropriate for residential in close proximity. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | If poultry units are removed this site becomes acceptable for residential. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site consists of part of a wider agricultural field, boundaries are defined by roads to north and east but are undefined to south and west.</p> <p>The site is located to the north of the village, associated with ribbon/dispersed development rather than the core of the villages and the services available within it.</p> <p>The site has medium-high visual sensitivity to residential development. Vehicular access is not achievable because Bicton Lane south of the site is too narrow and there is limited scope for widening or provision of a footway. HRA will be needed for impact of emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site. The site's poor Sustainability Appraisal rating is due to: its poor access to services and amenities; its location on the best and most versatile agricultural land; its location within a groundwater Source Protection Zone and its proximity to a Listed Building.</p> <p>Possible impact on listed buildings.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Retain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is located to the north of the village, associated with ribbon/dispersed development rather than the core of the villages and the services available within it. As such it is some distance from the services and facilities available within the village and there are considered to be more sustainable options available for development.</p> <p>Vehicular access is not achievable because Bicton Lane south of the site is too narrow and there is limited scope for widening or provision of a footway. Within the context of the proposed requirement for the village to 2036 there is considered to be a preferable site available within the settlement.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | BIT025 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Bicton Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. If the development delivered improvements along the site frontage on Bicton Lane. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | N. Potentially 30 homes and Bicton Lane south of the site is narrow there is limited scope for widening or provision of a footway. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in combination) of Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with occasional boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | Poultry units to north creating noise, odour, dusts that are not considered appropriate for residential in close proximity. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | If poultry units are removed this site becomes acceptable for residential. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Strategic Considerations:</p> | <p>The site consists of part of a wider agricultural field, boundaries are defined by roads to north and east but are undefined to south and west.</p> <p>The site is located to the north of the village, associated with ribbon/dispersed development rather than the core of the villages and the services available within it.</p> <p>The site has medium-high visual sensitivity to residential development. Vehicular access is not achievable because Bicton Lane south of the site is too narrow and there is limited scope for widening or provision of a footway.</p> <p>HRA will be needed for impact of emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site. The current poultry units on the site render it unsuitable for development: they would need to be removed before development would be acceptable.</p> <p>The site's poor Sustainability Appraisal rating is due to: its poor access to services and amenities; its location on the best and most versatile agricultural land; its location within a groundwater Source Protection Zone and its proximity to a Listed Building</p> |
| <p>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</p> | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| <p>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</p> | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| <p>Potential for Windfall?</p> | <p>No</p> |
| <p>Potential for Allocation?</p> | <p>No</p> |
| <p>Recommendation</p> | <p>Retain as countryside</p> |
| <p>Reasoning</p> | <p>The site is located to the north of the village, associated with ribbon/dispersed development rather than the core of the villages and the services available within it. As such it is some distance from the services and facilities available within the village and there are considered to be more sustainable options available for development.</p> <p>Vehicular access is not achievable because Bicton Lane south of the site is too narrow and there is limited scope for widening or provision of a footway.</p> <p>Within the context of the proposed requirement for the village to 2036 there is considered to be a preferable site available within the settlement.</p> |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</p> | |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</p> | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | BIT026 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 6% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | B4380 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Subject to the introduction of a suitable access junction and review and extension of the existing speed limit. Potentially 457 homes |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. The B4380 at this location still has the appearance of a high speed inter urban main road. Significant changes to the appearance of the section of B4380 between Bicton Village and Shrewsbury will be necessary before this and a number of other sites along the B4380 are developed. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Developable area reduced by possible presence of priority habitats, hedgerows and Env. Network. Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) of Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | The southern sections of the site (Calcott Moss and associated water course, previously LWS) are within the Env. Network, connected to the core area of Oxon Pool LWS. If priority habitats are present then these areas will need to be retained and appropriately buffered, along with the hedgerows and trees. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (records in ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, water voles, otters and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Potential to restore priority habitats of Calcott Moss and maintain key arm of the Environmental Network. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant field and boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road to north creating noise. Agricultural building (?) on the west boundary. Commercial to east. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. Additional separation away from agricultural and commercial activities on the site perimeter to ensure no impacts on existing buildings. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>A very large site consisting of a series of agricultural fields. Vehicular access is subject to significant changes to the appearance of the section of B4380 between Bicton Village and Shrewsbury before this and a number of other sites along the B4380 could be developed. HRA will be needed for impact of emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site. The developable area of the site is likely to be reduced to allow for buffering of the Environmental Network and priority habitats.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Retain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Whilst the site is relatively free of on-site constraints and safe access is considered achievable, the site is considered to be divorced from the urban edge of Shrewsbury and represents a fairly isolated countryside location. As such there are significant concerns over the site's overall sustainability, particularly in relation to how the site could encourage the use of sustainable transport modes. In addition the site's proximity to Bicton, along with the scale of growth proposed, raises concern as to the site's impact on the character of the village. It is envisaged the allocated SUE West situated to the south of the proposed site will be developed over the next 15 years and therefore it is not envisaged the site's proximity to Shrewsbury's urban edge will improve until much later in the plan period. It is considered there are far more sustainable options closer to the urban edge capable of delivering major sustainable greenfield land releases.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | BIT030 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Bicton Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Provided development funds appropriate improvements along Bicton Lane (along site frontage - widening and footway provision - which should be deliverable within highway land and the site. Potentially 57 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. Provided the development funds appropriate improvements along Bicton Lane (south of the site frontage) - widening and footway provision - which should be deliverable within highway land. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in combination) of Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | The site is within the Env. Network. The hedgerows/trees/scrub will have to be retained and appropriately buffered. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m/500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Site includes former walled garden for Bicton Hall (HER PRN 31547), which is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of LB, archaeological DBA). NB Archaeological DBA + building recording report produced in 2012 |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Any development on this site would need to be retain and conserve the walled garden and be of a high design standard (as per existing permissions) |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Park land with significant field and boundary trees, woodlands and hedgerows. TPOs on and / or adjacent to the site. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No significant constraints. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>An irregularly shaped site consisting of an agricultural field (divided in two by an access road running diagonally through the site from north west to south east); the walled garden of Bicton Hall; areas of dense woodland and a small agricultural barn. Site boundaries are defined by roads and field boundaries.</p> <p>The site is located to the north of the village, associated with ribbon/dispersed development rather than the core of the villages and the services available within it.</p> <p>The site has medium-high visual sensitivity to residential development.</p> <p>Vehicular access is subject to development funding appropriate improvements (widening and footway provision) along Bicton Lane south of the site frontage: these should be deliverable within highway land.</p> <p>HRA will be needed for impact of emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Retain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is located to the north of the village, associated with ribbon/dispersed development rather than the core of the villages and the services available within it. As such it is some distance from the services and facilities available within the village and there are considered to be more sustainable options available for development.</p> <p>The site contains the Bicton Hall walled garden.</p> <p>Within the context of the proposed requirement for the village to 2036 there is considered to be a preferable site available within the settlement.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BIT032 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Y. If the development can secure improvements (to adoptable highway standards) of the existing access track to B4380 which currently leads to Bicton House / Caravan Park. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Subject to the introduction of a suitable access junction and review and extension of the existing 30 speed limit. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. The B4380 at this location still has the appearance of a high speed inter urban main road. Significant changes to the appearance of the section of B4380 between Bicton Village and Shrewsbury will be necessary before this and a number of other sites along the B4380 are developed. For this site suitable crossing facilities of the B4380 would be needed to access village facilities by sustainable modes of transport. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) of Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. Protection of the woodland and pond will reduce the no. of houses possible. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | The woodland on the site lies in the Env. Network. This will need to be retained and adequately buffered. There is a confirmed GCN breeding pond on the site. Retention and protection of the pond (with appropriate buffer) will reduce the no. of houses possible. Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Trees, hedgerows, woodland and pond will need to be buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | Site likely to have a negative affect upon the setting of II Listed Bicton House (NHLE refs. 1366917) |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Contaminated land to west of site. Possible commercial activity to the south of site where there is an indentation in the southern site boundary. Unknown, possibly commercial use of land between site and Holyhead Road. Noise assessment required to meet standards. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Contaminated land assessment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Potential negative impact on Grade ii listed Bicton House . The site is detached from the main form of Bicton village, is located to the south of Holyhead Road, and is of a scale considered to be contrary to the overall strategy for the village. There remains more sustainable options elsewhere.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | |
| Potential for Windfall? | |
| Potential for Allocation? | |
| Recommendation | |
| Reasoning | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Community Hub: Bomere Heath

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM004 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Merrington Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Access works to include footway along frontage of site linking to existing on west side of Merrington Road. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | If priority habitats are present, development is not recommended. Developable area limited due to present of Env. Network/hedgerows/mature trees. Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. The entire site consists of Env. Network corridor. A PROW runs through the site. There are TPOs in the southern boundary. Would require botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | If priority habitat, site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Opportunity to enhance priority habitats. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant trees and hedgerows, in conservation area. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from road to the east of site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>A very large site located to the north of the village, consisting of a series of agricultural fields. Site boundaries are defined by property curtilages to the south, the road to the east, and field boundaries to the north and west.</p> <p>HRA may be needed for impact of increased emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site. Ecological survey work will be needed to determine presence/absence of priority habitats. If present, development is contrary to current Local Plan policy MD12. Site may have archaeological interest.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is very large in the context of Bomere Heath and there are no obvious opportunities to sub-divide the site. The scale of growth therefore raises concern as to the site's impact on the character of the village.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; will complement the current housing allocation, contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM016 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 12% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Shrewsbury Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Existing 30mph speed limit to be extended and any necessary traffic calming provided and footway provided on east side of Shrewsbury Road linking site to village. Crossing facility may ne required if continuous footway can not be achieved on the eastern side and western footway provided which may require third party land. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | There is a pond in the south-western section of the site. This will need to be appropriately buffered. A PROW runs along the eastern and southern boundaries. Botanical survey may be required for northern section of the site. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road to the west creating noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Strategic Considerations:</p> | <p>An irregularly shaped site located to the south of Bomere Heath. Site boundaries are defined by the road to the west, property curtilages to the north and field boundaries to south and east.</p> <p>Vehicular access is subject to an extension of the existing 30mph speed limit, traffic calming and a footway being provided on the east side of Shrewsbury Road linking the site to the village. A crossing facility may be required if footways can not be achieved on the eastern and western sides: this may require third party land. HRA may be needed for impact of increased emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site. Ecological survey work will be needed to determine presence/absence of priority habitats. If present, development is contrary to current Local Plan policy MD12.</p> <p>Site may have archaeological interest.</p> |
| <p>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</p> | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| <p>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</p> | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| <p>Potential for Windfall?</p> | <p>no</p> |
| <p>Potential for Allocation?</p> | <p>no</p> |
| <p>Recommendation</p> | <p>Remain as countryside</p> |
| <p>Reasoning</p> | <p>In meeting the proposed guideline for the village to 2036, and ensuring appropriate opportunities to utilise more central 'windfall/infill' development. It is considered there are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; will complement the current housing allocation, contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</p> | |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</p> | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM017 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 21% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Green Lane and Broomhall Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Existing 30mph speed limit to be extended and any necessary traffic calming provided and footway provided on east side of Shrewsbury Road linking site to village. Crossing facility may ne required if continuous footway can not be achieved on the eastern side and western footway provided which may require third party land. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. Provided traffic from the site can be prevented from using Broomhall Lane. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | If priority habitats are present, development is not recommended. Developable area limited due to present of Env. Network/ponds/mature trees. Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. The majority of the site consists of Env. Network corridor. There are TPOs on the site. There are ponds on and adjacent to the site. There are mature trees/hedgerows present. Requires botanical survey, ECLA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | If priority habitat, site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Opportunity to enhance priority habitats. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but medium size of site suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Land with extensive cover of significant trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No sig concerns |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site consists of two elements located to the north and south of Broomhall Lane. The southern element of the site contains a telephone exchange building, a number of mature trees along an access road (Green Lane), which further sub-divides the site, its boundaries are defined by the road, property curtilages and agricultural field boundaries. The northern element of the site is approximately rectangular, with boundaries defined by the road, property curtilages and field boundaries.</p> <p>Vehicular access is subject to an extension of the existing 30mph speed limit, traffic calming and a footway being provided on the east side of Shrewsbury Road linking the site to the village. A crossing facility may be required if footways can not be achieved on the eastern and western sides: this may require third party land.</p> <p>Off-site traffic improvements would only be achievable if traffic can be prevented from using Broomhall Lane.</p> <p>HRA may be needed for impact of increased emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site. Ecological survey work will be needed to determine presence/absence of priority habitats. If present, development is contrary to current Local Plan policy MD12.</p> <p>Site may have archaeological interest.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>no</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>no</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Much of the southern element of the site is heavily wooded and sub-divided and its southern element is further divided by an access road, significantly limiting developable area.</p> <p>Off-site traffic improvements would only be achievable if traffic can be prevented from using Broomhall Lane. Footpaths may involve third party land.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; will complement the current housing allocation, contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM019 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Shrewsbury Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Existing 30mph speed limit to be extended and any necessary traffic calming provided and footway provided on west side of Shrewsbury Road linking site to village. Shared access - possibly roundabout - to be considered with BOM020 and BOM016. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. A PROW crosses the site. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road to east creating noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is well related to the built form of the settlement and complements the current residential allocation. Site boundaries are defined by the road to the east, a development site to the north, a further promoted site to the south and is undefined to the west. HRA may be needed for impact of increased emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site. The site may have archaeological potential.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>Yes</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Allocate for residential development</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is well related to the built form of the settlement and complements the current residential allocation.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | <p>40 dwellings</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>Development to be accessed from Shrewsbury Road. Relocation of 30mph zone and potentially other traffic calming measures to be considered. Development to include a new pedestrian footpath linking the site to the services in the village.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | BOM020 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 11% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 44% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | T |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Shrewsbury Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Existing 30mph speed limit to be extended and any necessary traffic calming provided and footway provided on west side of Shrewsbury Road linking site to village. Shared access - possibly roundabout - to be considered with BOM019 and BOM016. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m/500m), badgers and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road to east creating noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site in isolation is separated from the built form of the village. However in combination with BOM019 it could represent a complementary extension of the current residential allocation.</p> <p>Site boundaries are defined by the road to the east, an area of open space to the south, a promoted site to the north and is undefined to the west.</p> <p>HRA may be needed for impact of increased emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>Yes</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Allocate for residential development</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site in isolation is separated from the built form of the village. However in combination with BOM019 it could represent an appropriately scaled and complementary extension of the current residential allocation, which together provide for the majority of identified requirement in the village to 2036.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | <p>15 dwellings</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>Development to follow the development of BOM019, with the potential to share the vehicular access. Relocation of 30mph zone and potentially other traffic calming measures to be considered. Development to include a new pedestrian footpath through BOM019 linking the site to the services in the village.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM021 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 21% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Merrington Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Existing 30mph speed limit to be extended and any necessary traffic calming provided and footway provided on east side of Merrington Road. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Site located adjacent to a possible Iron Age cropmark enclosure site (HER PRN 02418) |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Small area of unknown filled land on site. Contamination may be present. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Con land mitigation likely to be available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>A small site located to the north of Bomere Heath. Site boundaries are defined by the road and property curtilages to south and west, but are undefined to north and east.</p> <p>Due to the size, location and shape of the site it is likely to have only a limited capacity.</p> <p>Modelling of surface water flood risk may be needed (21% of the site is in the 1000 year surface flood risk zone). HRA may be needed for impact of increased emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site.</p> <p>Site located adjacent to possible Iron Age cropmark enclosure site.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>no</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>no</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Due to the size, location and shape of the site it is likely to have only a limited capacity.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; will complement the current housing allocation, contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM022 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 16% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Preston Gubbals Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Existing 30mph speed limit may need to be extended and any necessary traffic calming provided and footway provided on north side of Preston Gubbals Road. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | N. Preston Gubbals Road into the village can not be improved (insufficient highway width) to provide a footway enabling sustainable access into the village and local services. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | An Env. Network corridor runs along the northern boundary. This should be appropriately buffered. There are TPOs in the southern boundary. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Road to south creating noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is located to the west of Bomere Heath. Site boundaries are defined by the road and property curtilages to the south, further property curtilages to the west, a dense wooded belt to the north, but is undefined to the east.</p> <p>Vehicular access is not possible: there is insufficient highway width to provide a footway along Preston Gubbals Road into the village.</p> <p>HRA may be needed for impact of increased emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Vehicular access is not possible: there is insufficient highway width to provide a footway along Preston Gubbals Road into the village.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; will complement the current housing allocation, contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | BOM023 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 14% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Merrington Road and Wheat Hill Rise |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Existing 30mph speed limit to be extended and any necessary traffic calming provided and footway provided on east side of Merrington Road. Pedestrian and cycle access to be achieved onto Wheat Hill Rise. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | The southern and eastern boundaries form an Env. Network corridor and should be appropriately buffered. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Site includes a possible Iron Age cropmark enclosure site (HER PRN 02418). Whilst site has yet to be proven through evaluation, if genuine, it is extremely large and potentially require a very costly excavation that could effect viability (or be of national level significance). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | No significant constraints |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>A very large site located to the north of the village, consisting of a large agricultural field. Site boundaries are defined by property curtilages to the south, the road to the west, and field boundaries to the north and east.</p> <p>HRA may be needed for impact of increased emissions from road traffic on a Ramsar site.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p>No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p>No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p>Remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is very large in the context of Bomere Heath and there are no obvious opportunities to sub-divide the site. The scale of growth therefore raises concern as to the site's impact on the character of the village.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. These sites are considered to have a strong relationship to the built form of the settlement; will complement the current housing allocation, contribute to enhancement of community infrastructure; and offer the opportunity to meet the needs of the community.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Community Hub: Cross Houses

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | CSH003 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 15% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 36% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | A458 and unnamed road to Berrington. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Assuming suitable junction is provided within the frontage on the A458 only. Existing speed limit to be reviewed and extended and necessary traffic calming provided. Possibly roundabout on A458. Footway needed along site frontage on south side of A458. Potentially 72 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. Assuming the development funds new footway between the site and the existing footway on the south side of the A458 into the village and the estate road layout provides a continuous route for pedestrians and vehicles into the adjacent site CSH006. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | None |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. The hedgerows will need to be buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> Significant Constraints: | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> Other Constraints: | Site includes part of a cropmark complex of ring ditches and trackways (HR PRN 00477) of likely prehistoric date. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> Opportunities: | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> Significant Constraints: | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> Other Constraints: | Agricultural field with curtilage hedgerow and some mature trees within it |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside trees / hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> Significant Constraints: | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> Other Constraints: | Noise from road to the northeast |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> Management of Constraints: | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | -3 |
| Strategic Considerations: | This greenfield site lies on the south-east edge of Cross Houses but is poorly related to the built form of the settlement and forms part of the agricultural setting to the village. The site also carries evidence of prehistoric cropmark circles and would require a heritage assessment. The site has only medium-low visual and landscape sensitivity and so a design solution may address any impacts but this must include appropriate protection for the existing boundary hedgerow and field and boundary trees. The situation and use of the land would require appropriate ecological assessment and conservation, mitigation/enhancement of habitat and populations of protected and priority species. The site is also exposed to the noise effects from adjacent roadways at the A458 and the back lane to Berrington requiring a design solution to address this potential constraint. The distance between the site and the settlement will require significant highway infrastructure with a potential roundabout junction and provision of a footway link into the existing network. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Protect land within the Countryside |
| Reasoning | Cross Houses has continued to accommodate significant housing development due to past housing supply issues in the County despite the status of the village as a settlement in the Countryside. CSH003 would further increase the current built form and layout of the settlement and significantly increase the scale of the existing village and community in addition to other development already built and committed in Cross Houses. CSH003 is a relatively large site and would only be partially developed to meet the current needs of the settlement. This land is better reserved to meet the future development needs of the community. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | CSH004 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 9% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 12% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 19% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 1% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Unnamed road to Berrington & Eaton Mascott. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | N. The unnamed road to Berrington and Eaton Mascott is not suitable for an access from this site and additional traffic at its junction with the A458 should be avoided. Y. If access to the A458 can be secured through the allocated site to the north. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | N. The unnamed road to Berrington & Eaton Mascott has no footways and no potential for them to be provided between the site and the A458 which would be the only route for pedestrians into the village. Y. If access for pedestrians and vehicles can be achieved through the allocated site to the north. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Site within the Environmental network (disused railway line). Only much reduced housing would be possible. If priority habitats are present, this area should not be developed. Reduction in developable area available due to presence of ponds and possible mature trees. GCN pond present just outside the boundary, requiring terrestrial habitat on site. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | There is a pond on the site and a pond nearby with a record for GCN. Ponds (priority habitat) should be retained, buffered and connectivity increased, which will reduce the developable area available. If GCNs are present, a buffer of at least 50m around the pond is likely to be required, reducing the developable area available. The site may contain priority grassland habitat - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then this area of the site should not be developed. The site lies within an Env. Network corridor. There may be mature trees on the site. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (in buildings and trees), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. A PROW crosses the site. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | If priority habitat, those areas should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site includes the former Berrington Station (HER PRN 32904), which is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment (impact on setting of station) |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | Opportunities for former station buildings to be conserved and interpreted through a sympathetically designed scheme |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | This is a well tree'd site with a woodland edge along the northern curtilage and other scattered mature trees on site |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Areas of open space |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Contaminated land likely to be present across the site due to historic railway line. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Remediation may be possible. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | -7 |
| Strategic Considerations: | This site provides a unique brownfield opportunity comprising the former railway station and yard with other rail infrastructure and the railway track bed for the former Severn Valley Railway on the south-west edge of Cross Houses. The site is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The site itself forms part of the Green Infrastructure network with medium landscape and visual sensitivity. The northern tree lined boundary and southern hedgerows are worthy of protection along with the existing mature tree cover. The land would require appropriate ecological assessment with conservation, mitigation/enchantment of habitat and protected or priority species with particular reference to the presence of pond habitat in and around the site. This brownfield site relates well to the settlement following recent development to the north of CSH004. The primary access via Berrington Lane is inadequate to serve the whole site and this route extends the distance to the village services. The site is also served via a footpath from the adjoining development (north) which links directly to the A458 but does not provide an opportunity for a vehicular access. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Protect land within the Countryside |
| Reasoning | Cross Houses has continued to accommodate significant housing development due to past housing supply issues in the County despite the status of the village as a settlement in the Countryside. CSH004 would extend the settlement beyond its current built form and layout extending the settlement further to the south. The development of this site would also increase the scale of the existing village and community in addition to other development already built and committed in this part of the settlement. CSH004 is the smallest available development option in the settlement but has severely limited highway accessibility and an historical significance due to the presence on the site of some of the railway buildings and infrastructure of the former Berrington Station. This land is better reserved until the access issues can be properly addressed and a sympathetic development scheme proposed for the site. The land may therefore serve the future development needs of Cross Houses. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | CSH005 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 15% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium and Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium and Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | A458 and unnamed road to Berrington & Eaton Mascott. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Assuming suitable junction is provided within the frontage on the A458 and existing speed limit reviewed and extended and necessary traffic calming provided. Possibly roundabout on A458. Footway needed along site frontage on south side of A458. Potentially 85 homes. The unnamed road to Berrington and Eaton Mascott is not suitable for an access from this site and additional traffic at its junction with the A458 should be avoided. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Acknowledges that the unnamed road to Berrington has no footways and no potential for them to be provided and the pedestrian route into the village from this site would be along the A458. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | None |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | The western boundary forms an Env. Network corridor. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. The hedgerows and scrub will need to be buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impact on setting of Grade II listed Russell Place (NHLE ref. 1176971). Site includes part of the former Severn Valley Railway line (HER PRN 06024). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of LB). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Belt of trees on the SW curtilage particularly dense to the south. Hedgerows to the road frontage |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from railway to southwest. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the rail) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | -5 |
| Strategic Considerations: | This greenfield site lies to the west of Cross Houses and is not well related to the built form of the settlement and in part, lies within the route of the disused Severn Valley Railway serving Berrington/Cross Houses. The site adjoins Russell Place which is listed as Grade II. The site generally has medium-low landscape and visual sensitivity but has medium sensitivity in part. A design solution would therefore be needed to address any impacts but the site is more sensitive than other locations in the settlement. An assessment would be required of the belt of trees on the SW boundary and the road frontage hedgerows. The situation and use of the land would require appropriate ecological assessment and conservation, mitigation/enchantment of habitat and populations of protected and priority species. The site is exposed to the noise effects from adjacent roadways at the A458 and Berrington Lane. The distance between the site and the settlement would require significant highway infrastructure with a potential roundabout junction and provision of a footway link to the existing network. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Protect land within the Countryside |
| Reasoning | Cross Houses has continued to accommodate significant housing development due to past housing supply issues in the County despite the status of the village as a settlement in the Countryside. CSH005 is a relatively large and irregularly shaped site which would only be partially developed to meet the needs of the settlement. CSH005 would also extend the settlement in a linear form to the west of Cross Houses changing the current built form and layout in an usually truncated extension to the village. The delivery of the site would also significantly increase the scale of the existing village in addition to other development currently built and committed in the settlement. This elongated site along the A458 and would also require a highway access to be provided well beyond the current speed restrictions for the settlement on a narrow stretch of the A458 where visibility is also retracted by the elevation of the road above the village with the potential to create highway safety issues for all road users. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | CSH006 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Unnamed road to Berrington and into estate road link provided by the approved development site opt the north west of the site. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Y. Provided vehicular access to the unnamed road to Berrington is not permitted although pedestrian / cycle access should be provided. Potentially 127 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Assumes the development will fund an estate road vehicular and pedestrian link between CSH003 and the approved development to the north west of this site. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | None |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | The south-western boundary forms an Env. Network. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. The hedgerows will need to be buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> Significant Constraints: | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> Other Constraints: | No known archaeological interest but medium size of site, and proximity to archaeological cropmark features to E, suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> Opportunities: | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> Significant Constraints: | N/A |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> Other Constraints: | Abuts wooded train corridor on western boundary |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> Management of Constraints: | N/A |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> Opportunities: | Integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features (Hedgerows) and through the use 20% canopy cover policy |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> Significant Constraints: | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> Other Constraints: | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> Management of Constraints: | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> Opportunities: | No significant constraints. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | -2 |
| Strategic Considerations: | This greenfield site lies on the southern edge of Cross Houses and is well related to the built form of the settlement with existing development to the north and new construction to the west. The site is however physically separate from the A458 and would be accessed through the highways within adjacent developments assuming an extension to the estate roads is achievable. Access to the short section of the back lane to Berrington should be restricted to pedestrian and cycle access. The site is close to known cropmark circles to the east. The site would benefit from hedgerow provision to assimilate development into the landscape with protection of the wooded boundary to the disused railway line forming part of the Environmental Network to the south west. The situation and use of the land would require appropriate ecological assessment and conservation, mitigation/enchantment of habitat and populations of protected and priority species. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Protect land within the Countryside |
| Reasoning | Cross Houses has continued to accommodate significant housing development due to past housing supply issues in the County despite the status of the village as a settlement in the Countryside. CSH006 would further increase the current built form and layout of the settlement and significantly increase the scale of the existing village and community in addition to other development currently built and committed in Cross Houses. CSH006 is also relatively large and would only be partially developed to meet the current needs of the community. This land is better reserved to meet the future development needs of Cross Houses. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Community Hub: Dorrington

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | DGN002 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 41% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 59% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 41% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 21% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 41% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 15% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Station Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes footway will be provided along site frontage. Potentially 109 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | N. The site can not secure pedestrian improvements / footway along the section of Station Road leading into Dorrington. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | The eastern and southern boundaries form Env. Network corridors and the western boundary is adjacent to an Env. Network corridor. There are TPOs in the north-eastern hedgerow. Botanical survey may be required. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), otters, water voles, badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. The hedgerows and watercourse will need to be buffered. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological but medium size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. Site detached from existing built edge of settlement, so may effect rural historic character. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Large field site with hedgerows only to curtilages Two tree subject to TPO adjacent to north tip of site |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to add woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise and industrial noise to north, rail noise to west. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise and any other issues created by industrial to the north by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Dorrington. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the village. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | DGN015 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 14% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 86% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 11% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Bank Drive leading to The Bank |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. Subject to a review of the operation of The Bank junction onto the A49. A footpath link exists from Bank Drive to the A49 avoiding The Bank. Potentially 60 homes. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | The eastern boundary forms an Env. Network corridor. A watercourse runs through the south-eastern section. Botanical survey may be required. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (building and trees), GCNs (ponds within 500m), otters, water voles, badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. The hedgerows and watercourse will need to be buffered. A PROW runs through the site. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but location immediately adjacent to the historic core of the village and medium size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Field site has mature tree planting to curtilages 2 trees subject to TPO on SW curtilage |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Development density and layout needs to be low so that it is sustainably integrated into and compliments existing natural environment features |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Rail noise from rail to the east. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Dorrington. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the village. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | DGN016 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | The site does not appear to have direct access to the highway |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Botanical survey may be required. Requires Ecla and surveys for GCNs (ponds within 250m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Hedgerows will need to be buffered. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impact on setting of Grade II listed Old Vicarage (NHLE ref. 1175933). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of LB). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No trees - hedgerows to curtilages |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Hedgerow survey |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural buildings lose to the south of the site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Suggest stand off distance from agricultural buildings to ensure no conflict between land uses. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Dorrington. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the village. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | DGN017 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 11% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 17% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 83% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 18% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 29% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Via Falkland Road to the A49. Not directly onto A49 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Subject to a review of the extent of the existing speed limit on the A49 south of Dorrington and the funding of appropriate amendments. The site is approximately 500m from the village centre but the footway on the east side of the A49 is very narrow in places. Potentially 44 homes. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Otter records nearby. The southern and eastern boundaries form Env. Network corridors. Botanical survey may be required. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (building and trees), GCNs (ponds within 500m), otters, water voles, badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. The hedgerows and adjacent watercourse will need to be buffered. A PROW runs through the site. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Belt of mature trees on south curtilage |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Sewage works on site creating potential contaminated land concerns. Road noise to the west. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Con land assessment likely to be required. Mitigation likely to be achievable. Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | Development of this site removes sewage work impacts on residential to the north of the site. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Dorrington. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the village. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | DGN018 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium and Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium and Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | via Limes Paddock to A49 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Continuous footway into village and less than 500m from facilities and services |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Botanical survey may be required. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m/500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Hedgerows will need to be buffered. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Field site with hedgerow and scattered mature hedge trees to curtilages. TPO group adjacent to the south curtilage |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to the east. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Dorrington. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the village. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | DGN019 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 11% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 30% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Assumed through preceding phases of development off Forge Way. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. Subject to a review of the operation of the Forge Way junction onto the A49. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | A PROW runs through the site. There are TPOs on the site. Botanical survey may be required. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Hedgerows will need to be buffered. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impact on settings of Grade II listed Three Horseshoes Inn (NHLE ref. 1175949), The Old Post Office (NHLE ref. 1055669), and Dorrington House (NHLE ref. 1055670). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LB). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | High quality of design may be necessary to address any residual effects on settings of LBs |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Small site with a couple of mature curtilage trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retain existing trees on site |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No significant constraints. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Dorrington. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the village. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | DGN020 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 12% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 23% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Assumed through preceding phases of development off Forge Way. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. Subject to a review of the operation of the Forge Way junction onto the A49. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | A PROW crosses the site. There are TPOs on the site. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (in trees), grassland/botanical, GCNs (ponds within 250m/500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Hedgerows and trees will need to be buffered. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Probable impact on settings of Grade II listed Dorrington House (NHLE ref. 1055670), The Old Post Office (NHLE ref. 1055669) & The Horseshoes Inn (NHLE ref. 1175949). Poor relationship with existing built form of settlement. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment (impact on settings of LBs) |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | There are 8 mature trees subject to TPO's on this site and other mature trees to the curtilages |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Area of central open space |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Pub to the east creating potential noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Dorrington. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the village. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | DGN021 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Station Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes footway will be provided along site frontage. Potentially 128 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. Subject to a review of the pedestrian route into the village along Station Road and the provision of suitable improvements. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | The eastern boundary forms an Env. Network corridor. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. Hedgerows will need to be buffered. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological but medium size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Field site with internal hedgerow stream side trees to east side curtilage. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retain existing trees on site and create buffer zone to stream |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Rail to east with industrial to the other side and road to south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road and rail) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Dorrington. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the village. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Community Hub: Ford

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD007 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: | 8% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: | 10% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 16% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: | 1% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: | Yes |
| Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | Via B4393 onto the A458 and/or via unnamed road leading from eastern boundary of the site to the A458. |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Assumes the development can deliver a suitable new junction onto the Alberbury Road (B4393) for the traffic associated with potentially 440 homes. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? | Assumes the B4393 / A458 junction can accommodate the additional traffic from potentially 440 homes. The site is detached from the main settlement which will deter pedestrians from walking into the village. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. May trigger Natural England's SSSI IRZ. |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | North-eastern boundary is within Env. Network. EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds required. Hedgerows will need to be buffered. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12 |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impact on setting of Grade II listed Cross Gates (NHLE ref. 1308164). Site includes a cluster of three cropmark ring ditch (HER PRN 02125) of likely Early Bronze Age date, and a cropmark enclosure (HER PRN 02438) of likely Iron Age -Roman date. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of LB; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered boundary trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Poultry units to the north. Commercial/industrial to the south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Good separation distances away from poultry to the north. If housing proposed towards the northern boundary of the site odour assessment likely to be necessary. In respect of impacts from existing commercial/industrial to the south potential to mitigate noise etc. by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>This greenfield site sits to the west of Ford on land between the B4393 Alberbury road (west), the A458 road frontage with the Grade II listed Cross Gates building (south) and the country lane (east) that also serves site FRD009 and FRD013 and is considered unsuitable for increased vehicular traffic. The site lies within a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Ford village and with surface water flooding issues across part of the site. The site would affect the distant Hencott Pool RAMSAR site located to the east. The site may be accessed from the A458 subject to Highways England approval for changes to the trunk road network or from the B4393 Alberbury road. The open aspect of the site increases the landscape and visual sensitivity to medium and surface water flooding creates a risk to small areas of the site. The site is open with trees and hedgerows to the boundary along the disused rail line (east) offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including buffering to hedgerows and compensatory planting and other works to sustain the site character and the function of the eastern boundary as a core areas of the Environmental Network. Development leading to increased traffic movements will require a Habitat Regulations Assessment of the effects of increased road traffic emissions on Hencott Pool RAMSAR site to the east. The site has heritage value lying on the boundary and immediate setting of Ford Conservation Area with cropmarks and ditches of possible Bronze and Iron Age significance requiring a Heritage Assessment. The site has a Fair Sustainability Rating reflecting both the environmental values of the site, the challenges of accessing the land and the distance from key services in the village.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Remain as Countryside |
| Reasoning | <p>There are more preferable sites located closer to or available within the built form of the settlement which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this large, isolated site in the open countryside beyond the built form of the village. These other sites have better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer greater opportunities for planning gain, better access to the local highway network and may create more attractive gateways into the village. In contrast site FRD0007 would significantly extend the settlement well beyond its current built form and layout and would significantly increase the scale of the existing village whilst potentially compromising the open character and environmental values of FRD007.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD009 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: | Yes |
| Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Low |
| Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Low |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | Via un-named road leading from western boundary of the site to the A458 west of the B4393 junction. |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | N |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | N. The un-named road is derestricted and it would not be practical to introduce a speed limit at this isolated location to protect pedestrian activity. This site of potentially 41 homes should not have vehicular access from its eastern boundary to But Lane due to the very narrow nature of the roads linking it to But Lane and there being no pedestrian facilities. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | N |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? | N. Pedestrian access to this site is very poor and the necessary improvements would not be deliverable. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. May trigger Natural England's SSSI IRZ. |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m/500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds required. Botanical survey may be required. Hedgerows will need to be buffered. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12 |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | See accompanying document |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site wholly within Ford Conservation Area and may impact on it's character and appearance. Areas of archaeological interest located a short distance to the SE of the site, so it may have archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance of CA; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with occasional boundary trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Poultry houses to the west, possible slurry store to east(?).Poultry houses within 60m from the site. Would suggest that having residential here would have the potential to impact on the existing business therefore suggest this is not a suitable location for residential. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | This greenfield site sits to the north-west of Ford on land that rises away from the settlement, close to an existing poultry business and within a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Ford village and close to the Hencott Pool RAMSAR site located to the east. The site is otherwise bounded by open land and only served by an unrestricted country lane, and an existing concrete access track, providing poor pedestrian access and little capacity to speed restrict traffic movements. Traffic from the lane would need to connect to the A458 to the south close to the junction of the B4393 Alberbury Road rather than entering the village to the north. The open land is discretely enclosed and has low landscape and visual sensitivity and no known risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1). The site is open with boundary trees and hedgerows, offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including compensatory planting to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. Development leading to increased traffic movements will require a Habitat Regulations Assessment of the effects of increased road traffic emissions on Hencott Pool RAMSAR site to the east. The site lies in the Ford Conservation Area, close to several Grade II* listed buildings with archaeological interest requiring a Heritage Assessment. The site lies within 60 metres of an operating poultry enterprise that would have an adverse impact on residential amenity and in turn may limit the operation of the poultry enterprise. The site has a Fair Sustainability Rating reflecting both the environmental values of the site and the distance from key services in the village. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Remain as Countryside |
| Reasoning | <p>There are more preferable sites available within the settlement which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this moderate site in the open countryside close to existing uses that may adversely affect the amenity of any new residential development. Other sites in Ford have a better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer opportunities for planning gain, better access to the local highway network and could create more attractive gateways into the village. In contrast site CFRD009 would constitute an isolated residential enclave in the countryside extending the settlement well beyond its current built form and layout and potentially compromising the open character and environmental values of FRD009 and the surrounding countryside.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD011 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: | Yes |
| Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | But Lane |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Assumes footway will be provided along But Lane site frontage. Potentially 121 homes. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? | Assumes a review of the But Lane / A458 ghost island right turn lane junction demonstrates it can accommodate the additional traffic associated with this development. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. May trigger Natural England's SSSI IRZ. |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds required. Botanical survey may be required. Hedgerows will need to be buffered. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12 |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | See accompanying document |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological but medium size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with occasional boundary trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>This greenfield site sits on the southern edge of Ford on land that lies along the route of the A458, within a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Ford village and close to the Hencott Pool RAMSAR site located to the east. The site is bounded south by the A458 but set below the road level. But Lane bounds the site to the west and provides better frontage for highway access requiring a footway across the site frontage. The highway junction configuration should also address the continuing suitability of the existing traffic calming arrangements for the school access and the continuing suitability of the ghost island / right turning configuration on the A458. The site and adjacent properties would be exposed to the noise effects from the vehicular access to this site requiring an appropriate design solution. The open aspect of the site increases the landscape and visual sensitivity to medium but removes the risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1) across the site. The site is open with boundary trees and hedgerows offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including compensatory planting to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. Development leading to increased traffic movements will require a Habitat Regulations Assessment of the effects of increased road traffic emissions on Hencott Pool RAMSAR site to the east. The site has no known heritage value but the size and open character suggest the need for a Heritage Assessment. The site has a Good Sustainability Rating reflecting the environmental values of the site and the proximity of most of the key services in the village.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Allocate for housing development |
| Reasoning | <p>This is the preferred site for development in the village. This larger site requires a lower density development solution to deliver the scale of development that will satisfy the housing guideline and meet some of the infrastructure improvements required in Ford. This preferred site offers a better opportunity to meet the needs of the community with good access to the key services in the village. This site has a better relationship to the built form of the settlement with better access to the local highway network with the possibility of delivering highway improvements and much needed traffic calming measures. This site offers opportunities for planning gain including improvements to the traffic calming arrangements for the school access with a school parking and dropping off point within the site and improvements to the ghost island / right turning configuration on the A458. The development of this open site on the southern entrance to the village offers the opportunity to create an attractive gateway into the village. The development of this site, whilst lying in the countryside, offers the potential to consolidate the current built form and layout of the village requiring an appropriate design scheme and layout that respects the open character and environmental values of the site.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | 50 |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | <p>FRD011 will be developed in its entirety and will deliver a lower density development to satisfy the settlement housing guideline and provide infrastructure improvements to the benefit of the local community. Highway infrastructure improvements to address the capacity of the A458 ghost island right turning lane, create a suitable access on But Lane as a gateway feature to the village, the access positioned on the north end of this boundary (west) to avoid conflict with traffic movements along But Lane and into/from the A458 junction, remove the traffic calming measures around the school and replace with school parking and dropping off point within FRD011, extend pedestrian and cycling links from the existing networks to include the existing footpath (PROW) through FRD011 linking the A458 to Quail Ridge. An improved access across the A458 to the services on the south side should also be considered. Protect existing mature trees and hedgerows particularly around the new highway access on But Lane with compensatory planting to replace any removal of the existing. Landscaping to enclose the development from Quail Ridge and adjacent countryside (east) to protect the amenity of existing and new residents. Separation distance, layout, dwelling orientation, acoustic design/materials and green infrastructure to enclose the southern edge of the village will manage noise from the A458. Traffic volume increases may require a Habitats Regulations Assessment of impacts on the distant Hencott Pool Ramsar site. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken particularly transport assessments, heritage assessment with particular focus on potential archaeology, ecology, tree and hedgerow surveys, surface water flood risk and drainage. Recommendations to be clearly reflected in the development scheme.</p> |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD012 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 3% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Un-named road leading to Shoothill south of A458. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund improvements along the frontage to the un-named road south of the A458 including facilities for pedestrians. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. Assuming development will fund pedestrian crossing facilities and other appropriate improvements at the But Lane / A458 cross road junction for sustainable access to the village facilities. The site is detached from the main settlement which will deter pedestrians from walking into the village even with crossing facilities on the A458. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. May trigger Natural England's SSSI IRZ. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds required. Botanical survey may be required. Hedgerows will need to be buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12 |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological but medium size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). NB geophysical survey of N corner of site completed in 2014. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to north and commercial garages and restaurant to the northeast. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise etc. by location (separation distances to the road and commercial activities) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>This greenfield site sits to the south of Ford on land separated from the village by the A458. The site is within a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Ford village and is close to the Hencott Pool RAMSAR site located to the east. The site is bounded north by the A458 but set below the road level. An unnamed lane to Shoothill bounds the site to the west and provides a potential frontage for highway access and carriageway improvements. A new highway should also provide a footway along the frontage, a pedestrian crossing to the village and improvements around the A458/But Lane junction to facilitate vehicular and pedestrian movements for the local community. The site and adjacent properties would be exposed to the noise effects from the vehicular access to this site requiring an appropriate design solution. The open aspect of the site increases the landscape and visual sensitivity to medium but removes the risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1) across the site. The site is open with boundary trees and hedgerows offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including compensatory planting to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. Development leading to increased traffic movements will require a Habitat Regulations Assessment of the effects of increased road traffic emissions on Hencott Pool RAMSAR site to the east. The site has no known heritage value but the size and open character suggest the need for a Heritage Assessment. The site has a Good Sustainability Rating reflecting the environmental values of the site and the proximity of most of the key services in the village.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Remain as Countryside |
| Reasoning | <p>There are more preferable sites available within the settlement which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this moderate site in the open countryside despite the proximity of some key local services. Other sites in Ford such as FRD011 have a better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer greater opportunities for planning gain, better access to the local highway network and could create a more attractive gateway into the main area of the village. In contrast site FRD012 would constitute a fairly isolated residential enclave in the countryside extending the settlement well beyond its current built form and layout and potentially compromising the open character and environmental values of FRD012 and the surrounding countryside. It is also considered that the distance and challenge of reaching services in the main settlement may deter pedestrians from walking into the village even though a crossing might be provided.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD013 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 94% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 2% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Potentially directly on to A458 or via the un-named road leading from the northern boundary of the site to the A458 west of the B4393 junction. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes Highways England will accept a new junction onto the A458 and or additional traffic at the existing junction. Potentially 310 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Assumes Highways England will accept a new junction onto the A458 and or additional traffic at the existing junction. Potentially 310 homes. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. May trigger Natural England's SSSI IRZ. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Eastern and western boundaries fall within Env. Network corridors. Watercourse runs adjacent to eastern boundary. EclA and surveys for bats (trees and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds required. Hedgerows and watercourse will need to be buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12 |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site adjacent to boundary, and within setting of, Ford Conservation Area. Site includes the cropmark ring ditch (HER PRN 03718) of likely Early Bronze Age date, and a possible cropmark enclosure (HER PRN 03719) of likely Iron Age -Roman date. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of CA; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land significant trees forming arboricultural feature along the watercourse, boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No significant constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>This greenfield site sits to the west of Ford on land between the watercourse through Ford (east), the A458 road frontage (south) and the country lane (west) that also serves site FRD009 and is considered unsuitable for increased vehicular traffic. The site lies within a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Ford village and close to the Hencott Pool RAMSAR site located to the east. The site may be accessed from the A458 subject to Highways England approval for changes to the trunk road network. The open aspect of the site increases the landscape and visual sensitivity to medium and the watercourse creates a risk of flooding onto small areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 with some the risk of surface water flooding. The site is open with trees and hedgerows to the boundary and watercourse offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including buffering to hedgerows and the watercourse, compensatory planting and other works to sustain the site character and the function of the eastern and western boundaries as core areas of the Environmental Network. Development leading to increased traffic movements will require a Habitat Regulations Assessment of the effects of increased road traffic emissions on Hencott Pool RAMSAR site to the east. The site has heritage value lying on the boundary and immediate setting of Ford Conservation Area with cropmarks and ditches of possible Bronze and Iron Age significance requiring a Heritage Assessment. The site has a Poor Sustainability Rating reflecting the environmental values of the site, the challenges of accessing the land and the distance from the key services in the village.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Remain as Countryside |
| Reasoning | There are more preferable sites available within the settlement which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this larger site in the open countryside. These other sites have better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer greater opportunities for planning gain, better access to the local highway network and may create more attractive gateways into the village. In contrast site FRD013 would significantly extend the settlement well beyond its current built form and layout and would significantly increase the scale of the existing village whilst potentially compromising the open character and environmental values of FRD013. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD014 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 11% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 16% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 84% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: | 4% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: | 4% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 5% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: | 18% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: | Yes |
| Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | A458 |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Assumes Highways England will accept a new junction onto the A458. This will be necessary as the new development to the east of the site has a ransom strip along the shared boundary. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. May trigger Natural England's SSSI IRZ. |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | Western boundary falls within Env. Network corridor. Watercourse runs adjacent to western boundary. EclA and surveys for bats (buildings, trees and transects), GCNs (ponds within 250m/500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds required. Hedgerows and watercourse will need to be buffered, which may reduce developable area. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12 |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | See accompanying document |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site wholly within Ford Conservation Area and may impact on it's character and appearance. Site includes an ?early 19th century house and outbuilding, now known as Brookfield, both of which are likely to be non-designated heritage assets |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance of CA; Level 2 historic building assessment if demolition of existing buildings proposed). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | Retain historic buildings at Brookfield |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Significant trees on the west boundary and trees and hedgerows on and adjacent to the site. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to the south |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise etc. by location (separation distances to the road and commercial activities) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>This greenfield site sits to the west of Ford on land between the watercourse through Ford (west), the A458 road frontage (south) and the countryside adjacent to the built form of the village (west). The site lies within a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Ford village and close to the Hencott Pool RAMSAR site located to the east. The site may be accessed from the A458 subject to Highways England approval for changes to the trunk road network. The open aspect of the site increases the landscape and visual sensitivity to medium and the watercourse creates an increased risk of flooding onto small areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 with some the risk of surface water flooding. The site is open with trees and hedgerows to the boundary and watercourse offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including buffering to hedgerows and the watercourse, compensatory planting and other works to sustain the site character and the function of the eastern and western boundaries as core areas of the Environmental Network. Development leading to increased traffic movements will require a Habitat Regulations Assessment of the effects of increased road traffic emissions on Hencott Pool RAMSAR site to the east. The site has heritage value lying wholly within Ford Conservation Area with distinctive historical buildings considered to be non-designated heritage assets requiring a Heritage Assessment. The site has a Good Sustainability Rating reflecting the environmental values of the site and the proximity of most of the key services in the village.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Remain as Countryside |
| Reasoning | <p>There are more preferable sites available within the settlement which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this larger site in the open countryside. These other sites have better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer greater opportunities for planning gain, better access to the local highway network and may create more attractive gateways into the village. In contrast site FRD014 would extend the settlement beyond its current built form and layout and would further increase the scale of the existing village whilst potentially compromising the open character and environmental values of both FRD014 and the adjoining site FRD013.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | FRD016 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: | Yes |
| Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | Unclassified Road leading the St Michael's Church |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Assuming only limited development of the site. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? | Assuming only limited development of the site given the unclassified road is narrow with no footway but carries little traffic. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Possible HRA required due to road emissions from increased traffic (in-combination) on Hencott Pool Ramsar. See LPR HRA. May trigger Natural England's SSSI IRZ. |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | EclA and surveys for bats (buildings and trees), GCNs (ponds within 250m/500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds required. Botanical survey may be required. Hedgerows will need to be buffered. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12 |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | See accompanying document |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impacts on settings of Grade II* listed Ford House (NHLE ref. 1308164) and associated grade II listed barn and attached courtyard wall c.30m N of Ford House (NHLE ref. 1366876) and stable block and attached forecourt wall c.5m N of Ford House (NHLE ref. 1308147). Site adjacent to boundary, and within setting of, Ford Conservation Area. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs and CA). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | High standard of design required if development to address potential impacts on settings of heritage assets. It is noted, however, that the site is already partially developed. |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with scattered boundary trees and hedgerows |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of exiting mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No sig concerns. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>This greenfield site sits some distance to the north of Ford. The site still lies within the Source Protection Zone encompassing Ford village and close to the Hencott Pool RAMSAR site located to the east. The site comprises a group of agricultural buildings served by an unnamed lane and bounded by the countryside offering a potential highway access assuming a limited scale of development of the site. The open aspect of the site increases the landscape and visual sensitivity to medium but removes the risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1) across the site. The site is open with scattered boundary trees and hedgerows offering some habitat for protected or priority species and requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including compensatory planting to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. Development leading to increased traffic movements will require a Habitat Regulations Assessment of the effects of increased road traffic emissions on Hencott Pool RAMSAR site to the east. The site has no known heritage value but lies in the setting of Grade II and II* listed buildings requiring a Heritage Assessment. The site has a Poor Sustainability Rating reflecting the environmental values of the site, the challenges of accessing the land and the distance from the key services in the village.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Remain as Countryside |
| Reasoning | There are more preferable sites available within the settlement which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this small isolated site in the open countryside. Other sites that are better related to the village of Ford have better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer opportunities for planning gain, better access to the local highway network and could create more attractive gateways into the village. In contrast site FRD015 would constitute an isolated residential enclave in the countryside entirely unrelated to the settlement being located well beyond its current boundary and potentially compromising the open character and environmental values of FRD015 and the surrounding countryside. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Community Hub: Hanwood

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | HWD004 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | A488 |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Preference would be for this site to share the A488 access created for the permitted development to the east of this site. Assumes the existing 30mph speed limit is reviewed and extended. Footway in place into village. Potentially 50 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. HRA may also require consideration of in-combination effects of road emissions from increased traffic in relation to Hencott Pool Ramsar. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | EclA and surveys for GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. A PROW runs along the northern boundary. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12 |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological but medium size of site suggests it may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site devoid of trees a roadside hedgerow to the frontage |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for planting of new trees. |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside trees / hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to the south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road and rail) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Sustainability Appraisal Conclusion: | -2 |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site is located adjacent to a development site on the outskirts of Hanwood. The site is located within the green gap between Hanwood and Cruckmeole, the retention of this gap is considered a key community priority.</p> <p>5% of the site is located within the 1,000 year surface water flood zone.</p> <p>HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on the Stiperstones and the Hollies SAC and may be required for in-combination effects of road emissions on Hencott Pool Ramsar.</p> <p>The road to the south may be a source of noise.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |
| Reasoning | <p>The site is located adjacent to a development site on the outskirts of Hanwood. The site is located within the green gap between Hanwood and Cruckmeole, the retention of this gap is considered a key community priority.</p> <p>Available information about local housing need suggests that the greatest need is for affordable and low cost market housing of a range of types and tenures. Furthermore there are already significant existing commitments in the settlement. As such no allocations are proposed and it is instead proposed that the remaining housing guideline will be delivered through infill development and appropriately located small-scale exception sites.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
| Site Reference: | HWD005 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | No |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 6% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 16% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 5% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Possible link into Orchard Lane? |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Access into Orchard Lane looks problematic - sufficient width? Trees in middle of Lane? |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Is access to footways at junction with A 486 plus nearby controlled pedestrian crossing. (Cars from garage may interfere with visibility at junction) |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. HRA may also require consideration of in-combination effects of road emissions from increased traffic in relation to Hencott Pool Ramsar. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | A large proportion of the site is Lowland mixed deciduous woodland (priority habitat) and is also Env. Network corridor. This should not be included in the developable area. This greatly reduces the developable area. EclA and botanical survey and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds required. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | There are priority habitats on the site. Development not recommended. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site includes former clay pit for a brick works (HER PRN 04252) and is therefore considered to have some archaeological interest. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Woodland covers a third of the site. Agricultural land with significant trees, hedgerow and areas of woodland that are key features of the rural landscape. Would provide very limited opportunity for development. |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Some open areas |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Possible very low density in open areas Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the town. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Contaminated land likely due to past land use. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Remediation for any contaminated land likely to be available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Sustainability Appraisal Conclusion: | -1 |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>6% of the site is located within the 30 year surface water flood zone. 10% is within the 100 year surface water flood zone. 16% is located within the 1,000 year surface water flood zone. Furthermore 5% of the site is located within 20m of an historic flood event.</p> <p>Access to the site is proposed via a private drive of limited width and provides access onto Orchard Lane which has bridleway status. The existing route to the site is not considered suitable for traffic associated with the development at the point of access, due to its restricted width. Orchard Lane is also constrained at its junction with Weir Road and its close proximity to the A488 junction. Significant works would be required to achieve an appropriate access and the ability to achieve these works would be subject to a number of factors including whether there is sufficient width in the road, management of trees in middle of Lane, whether the junction of the access lane and Orchard Lane can be brought up to an appropriate standard and whether the junction with Weir Road can be improved to support development of all or part of the site.</p> <p>HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on the Stiperstones and the Hollies SAC and may be required for in-combination effects of road emissions on Hencott Pool Ramsar.</p> <p>A large portion of the site is a priority habitat (woodland) and located within an environmental network.</p> <p>The site may contain contaminated land.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |
| Reasoning | <p>Access to the site is proposed via a private drive of limited width and provides access onto Orchard Lane which has bridleway status. The existing route to the site is not considered suitable for traffic associated with the development at the point of access, due to its restricted width. Orchard Lane is also constrained at its junction with Weir Road and its close proximity to the A488 junction. Significant works would be required to achieve an appropriate access and the ability to achieve these works would be subject to a number of factors including whether there is sufficient width in the road, management of trees in middle of Lane, whether the junction of the access lane and Orchard Lane can be brought up to an appropriate standard and whether the junction with Weir Road can be improved to support development of all or part of the site.</p> <p>A large portion of the site is a priority habitat (woodland).</p> <p>Available information about local housing need suggests that the greatest need is for affordable and low cost market housing of a range of types and tenures. Furthermore there are already significant existing commitments in the settlement. As such no allocations are proposed and it is instead proposed that the remaining housing guideline will be delivered through infill development and appropriately located small-scale exception sites.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Community Hub: Longden

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN002 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Longden Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund suitable estate road access and review and extension of existing 30mph speed limit with any necessary traffic calming and provide footway along site frontage on west side of Longden Road. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. If land can be secured to deliver footway link into the village from the site on the western side of Longden Road. There does not appear to be sufficient verge to deliver this within highway land. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m, badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. There is a pond on the site - if GCNs are present, a min. 50m buffer will be required. Trees and hedgerows and pond should be protected and buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but medium size of site suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA and ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to the east. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances to the road, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Development would need to fund a suitable estate road access, extend the 30mph speed limit/provide appropriate traffic calming and provide a footway along the sites frontage with Longden Road.</p> <p>Development of the site could not occur without off-site works, specifically the provision of a footway link into the village from the site on the western site of Longden Road (this would involve securing land beyond the site boundary as there does not appear to be sufficing highway verge).</p> <p>HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on the Stiperstones and Hollies SAC.</p> <p>The site may be of archaeological interest.</p> <p>The road to the east is a potential source of noise.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Reasoning</p> | <p>Development of the site could not occur without off-site works, specifically the provision of a footway link into the village from the site on the western site of Longden Road (this would involve securing land beyond the site boundary as there does not appear to be sufficing highway verge).</p> <p>Available information about local housing need suggests that the greatest need is for affordable and low cost market housing of a range of types and tenures. Furthermore it is recognised that there has been significant development in the village over recent years and there are already significant existing commitments in the settlement. As such no allocations are proposed and it is instead proposed that the remaining housing guideline will be delivered through infill development and appropriately located small-scale exception sites.</p> |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</p> | |
| <p>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</p> | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| Site Reference: | LGN005 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Summerhouse Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund suitable access provide footway along site frontage on south side of Summerhouse Lane. Potentially 57 homes. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | N. The scale of development would require improvements (including provision of a footway) along Summerhouse Lane west of the site linking it to the village and these are no deliverable without third party land. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | There are GCN breeding ponds to the north-east of this site - a Natural England EPS licence is likely to be required for works on this site. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Trees and hedgerow should be protected and buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Potential impact on setting of Grade II listed Hall Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1366675). No known archaeological interest but medium size of site suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of LB; archaeological DBA and ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with occasional boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Existing commercial/agricultural to the north creating possible noise, odour, dusts. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances to the road, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. Suggest separation distance for reductions in odour and dust impacts. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Development would need to fund a suitable estate road access and provide a footway along the sites frontage with Summerhouse Lane.</p> <p>Development of the site could not occur without off-site works, specifically the provision of a footway link into the village along Summerhouse Lane. This is not considered deliverable without third party land.</p> <p>HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on the Stiperstones and Hollies SAC.</p> <p>Development of the site may impact on the setting of the Grade II listed Hall Farmhouse.</p> <p>The site may be of archaeological interest.</p> <p>Commercial/agricultural uses to the north may be a source of noise, odour and dust.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>Development of the site could not occur without off-site works, specifically the provision of a footway link into the village along Summerhouse Lane. This is not considered deliverable without third party land.</p> <p>Development of the site may impact on the setting of the Grade II listed Hall Farmhouse.</p> <p>Available information about local housing need suggests that the greatest need is for affordable and low cost market housing of a range of types and tenures. Furthermore it is recognised that there has been significant development in the village over recent years and there are already significant existing commitments in the settlement. As such no allocations are proposed and it is instead proposed that the remaining housing guideline will be delivered through infill development and appropriately located small-scale exception sites.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN011 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 7% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Little Barnyard |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund suitable estate road access and review and extension of existing 30mph speed limit with any necessary traffic calming and provide footway along site frontage on north side of Little Barnyard. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Assumes development will fund footway link between site frontage and existing footway on north side of Little Barnyard leading into village. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m/250m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Trees and hedgerows should be protected and buffered. A PROW runs along the western boundary. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Site detached from existing built edge of settlement |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant boundary trees and hedgerows, occasional field tree. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No significant constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | Development would need to fund a suitable estate road access, extend the 30mph speed limit/provide appropriate traffic calming, provide a footway along the sites frontage with Little Barnyard and fund a footway link from that on the sites frontage to the existing footway on the north site of Little Barnyard into the village. HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on the Stiperstones and Hollies SAC. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>Available information about local housing need suggests that the greatest need is for affordable and low cost market housing of a range of types and tenures. Furthermore it is recognised that there has been significant development in the village over recent years and there are already significant existing commitments in the settlement. As such no allocations are proposed and it is instead proposed that the remaining housing guideline will be delivered through infill development and appropriately located small-scale exception sites.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN014 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Little Barnyard |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund suitable estate road access and review and extension of existing 30mph speed limit with any necessary traffic calming and provide footway along site frontage on north side of Little Barnyard. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Assumes development will fund footway link between site frontage and existing footway on north side of Little Barnyard leading into village. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m/250m), badgers and nesting birds. Trees and hedgerows should be protected and buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No significant constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Development would need to fund a suitable estate road access, extend the 30mph speed limit/provide appropriate traffic calming, provide a footway along the sites frontage with Little Barnyard and fund a footway link from that on the sites frontage to the existing footway on the north site of Little Barnyard into the village.</p> <p>HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on the Stiperstones and Hollies SAC.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>Available information about local housing need suggests that the greatest need is for affordable and low cost market housing of a range of types and tenures. Furthermore it is recognised that there has been significant development in the village over recent years and there are already significant existing commitments in the settlement. As such no allocations are proposed and it is instead proposed that the remaining housing guideline will be delivered through infill development and appropriately located small-scale exception sites.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN015 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Little Barnyard |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund suitable estate road access and review and extension of existing 30mph speed limit with any necessary traffic calming and provide footway along site frontage on south side of Little Barnyard. Pedestrian and cycle (only) access to be provided to the highway from the southern boundary of the site. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Assumes development will fund footway link between site frontage and existing footway on north side of Little Barnyard leading into village. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | There are some TPOs in the boundaries. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Trees and hedgerows should be protected and buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but medium size of site suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA and ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant boundary trees and hedgerows, TPO trees on and adjacent to the site. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | No significant constraints noted. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The sites southern access is only appropriate for pedestrian and cycles.</p> <p>Development would need to fund a suitable estate road access, extend the 30mph speed limit/provide appropriate traffic calming, provide a footway along the sites frontage with Little Barnyard and fund a footway link from that on the sites frontage to the existing footway on the north site of Little Barnyard into the village.</p> <p>HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on the Stiperstones and Hollies SAC.</p> <p>There are some trees subject to TPO protection on the site.</p> <p>The site may be of archaeological interest.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>Available information about local housing need suggests that the greatest need is for affordable and low cost market housing of a range of types and tenures. Furthermore it is recognised that there has been significant development in the village over recent years and there are already significant existing commitments in the settlement. As such no allocations are proposed and it is instead proposed that the remaining housing guideline will be delivered through infill development and appropriately located small-scale exception sites.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN016 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Little Barnyard |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund suitable estate road access and review and extension of existing 30mph speed limit with any necessary traffic calming and provide footway along site frontage on south side of Little Barnyard. Pedestrian and cycle (only) access to be provided to the highway from the southern boundary of the site. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Assumes development will fund footway link between site frontage and existing footway on north side of Little Barnyard leading into village. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | There are some TPOs in the boundaries. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Trees and hedgerows should be protected and buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but medium size of site suggests it may have some potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA and ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant boundary trees and hedgerows. Access from Well Mead Lane may Impact on significant TPO tree. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible road noise from road to the south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances to the road, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. Suggest separation distance is most preferable. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The sites southern access is only appropriate for pedestrian and cycles.</p> <p>Development would need to fund a suitable estate road access, extend the 30mph speed limit/provide appropriate traffic calming, provide a footway along the sites frontage with Little Barnyard and fund a footway link from that on the sites frontage to the existing footway on the north site of Little Barnyard into the village.</p> <p>There are some trees subject to TPO protection on the site.</p> <p>The site may be of archaeological interest.</p> <p>The road to the south is a potential source of noise.</p> <p>The site performs poorly within Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>Available information about local housing need suggests that the greatest need is for affordable and low cost market housing of a range of types and tenures. Furthermore it is recognised that there has been significant development in the village over recent years and there are already significant existing commitments in the settlement. As such no allocations are proposed and it is instead proposed that the remaining housing guideline will be delivered through infill development and appropriately located small-scale exception sites.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN017 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Longden Road |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund suitable access and review and extension of existing 30mph speed limit with any necessary traffic calming and provides footway along site frontage on east side of Longden Road. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. If footway linking can be delivered into the village or other safety improvements for pedestrians. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m/250m), badgers and nesting birds. Hedgerows should be protected and buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with occasional boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road to the west creating noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances to the road, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. Suggest separation distance is most preferable. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Development would need to fund a suitable estate road access, extend the 30mph speed limit/provide appropriate traffic calming and provide a footway along the sites frontage with Longden Road.</p> <p>Development of the site could not occur without off-site works, specifically the provision of a footway link or other safety improvements for pedestrians into the village from the site.</p> <p>The road to the west is a potential source of noise.</p> <p>The site performs poorly within Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>Development of the site could not occur without off-site works, specifically the provision of a footway link or other safety improvements for pedestrians into the village from the site. Available information about local housing need suggests that the greatest need is for affordable and low cost market housing of a range of types and tenures. Furthermore it is recognised that there has been significant development in the village over recent years and there are already significant existing commitments in the settlement. As such no allocations are proposed and it is instead proposed that the remaining housing guideline will be delivered through infill development and appropriately located small-scale exception sites.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | LGN020 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | School Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund suitable estate road access and review and extension of existing 30mph speed limit with any necessary traffic calming and provide footway along site frontage on north side of School Lane. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | If site is able to deliver footway along School Lane linking site to village within existing highway land. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m/500m), badgers and nesting birds. The hedgerows should be protected and buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | See accompanying document |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with occasional boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible road noise to the south. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances to the road, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | Development would need to fund a suitable estate road access, extend the 30mph speed limit/provide appropriate traffic calming, provide a footway along the sites frontage with School Lane and fund a footway link from that on the sites frontage into the village on highway land. The road to the south is a potential source of noise. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Retain as countryside. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reasoning | <p>Available information about local housing need suggests that the greatest need is for affordable and low cost market housing of a range of types and tenures. Furthermore it is recognised that there has been significant development in the village over recent years and there are already significant existing commitments in the settlement. As such no allocations are proposed and it is instead proposed that the remaining housing guideline will be delivered through infill development and appropriately located small-scale exception sites.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Community Hub: Nesscliffe

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES002 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low and Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium and Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Former A5 through village |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund an appropriate estate road access and review and possibly extend the existing 30mph speed limit. Footway is in place. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Protection of the Env. Network, buffer to Ancient Woodland and pond will reduce the developable area available. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | The site is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site and Env. Network core area - this must be appropriately buffered. There is a group of TPO'd trees in the north-western corner. A PROW runs around the northern boundaries. There is a pond on the site. If GCNs are present, a min. 50m buffer will be required around the ponds, reducing the developable area available. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers (records in the south of the site), reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Potential impacts on settings of Scheduled Monument of Kynaston's Cave (NHLE ref. 1006286) and Grade II listed Nesscliffe Hotel (NHLE ref. 1366938). No known archaeological interest but medium size suggests site may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of SM and LB, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | S106 monies for conservation management plan for Kynaston's Cave. |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with boundary trees and hedgerows, some TPOs on or adjacent to the site. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Some potential contaminated land on site and off site. Possible noise from road to the south and from activities at Nesscliffe Hotel. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Remediation for contaminated land likely to be available. Mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road and hotel) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Greenfield site near Nesscliffe at foot of Nesscliffe Hill Country Park. Site is currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops.</p> <p>The site has Medium-High Landscape and Visual Impact Considerations</p> <p>The site is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site and Env. Network core area</p> <p>Heritage Assessment required with application</p> <p>Some potential contaminated land on and opposite site</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Assumes development will fund an appropriate estate road access and review and possibly extend the existing 30mph speed limit. Footway is in place.</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>S106 monies for conservation management plan for Kynaston's Cave.</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p style="text-align: center;">Remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Nesscliffe is an existing Community Hub which set out a nominal increase in its housing stock. However, the village has attracted significant demand being located close to Shrewsbury and a considerable volume of new housing has now been committed as a result of a shortfall in the housing supply in Shropshire. The volume of additional completed and committed dwellings proposed in the village (102 dwellings at 31 March 2019) now significantly exceeds the total dwelling stock of the existing village (83 dwellings). Local aspirations for this Community Hub are for this significant new housing development to be delivered to sustain Nesscliffe as a sustainable settlement and for the community to assimilate this considerable growth.</p> <p>The community also wish to see some further small scale, windfall housing development to meet the community's local housing needs for high quality, affordable housing. Site NES009X with a site area of less than 0.2 ha (at 0.16ha), situated in the south of the village and located within the village development boundary is considered to be a suitable site to help to meet this windfall allowance.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES003 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Hopton Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund Hopton Lane improvements along site frontage and suitable pedestrian crossing facilities to west side of the lane. Footway on east side of lane along site frontage will need creativity solution to make provision for mature trees along the site boundary. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | Protection of the Env. Network, buffer to the Ancient Woodland and pond will reduce the developable area available. May trigger Natural England's SSSI IRZ. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | The site is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site, Ancient Woodland and Env. Network core area - this must be appropriately buffered. There are TPOs on the site. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Buffer to Ancient Woodland. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | Probable negative impact on setting of Scheduled Monument of Nesscliffe Hill Camp (NHLE ref. 1020285). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but medium size and proximity to hillfort suggests site may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of SM, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant field and boundary trees, some TPO'd and hedgerows. Significant area of woodland along east and south boundary. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Possible contaminated land from historic activities off site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Remediation likely to be available. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Greenfield site on N edge of Nesscliffe to E of residential estate development of The Crescent and individual properties on Hopton Lane, also to E of primary school and W (adjoining) Nesscliffe LWS and Country Park.</p> <p>The site has Medium-High Landscape and Visual Impact Considerations</p> <p>Heritage Assessment required with application</p> <p>Possible contaminated land from historic activities off site.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Assumes development will fund Hopton Lane improvements along site frontage and suitable pedestrian crossing facilities to west side of the lane. Footway on east side of lane along site frontage will need creativity solution to make provision for mature trees along the site boundary.</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement.</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p style="text-align: center;">Remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Nesscliffe is an existing Community Hub which set out a nominal increase in its housing stock. However, the village has attracted significant demand being located close to Shrewsbury and a considerable volume of new housing has now been committed as a result of a shortfall in the housing supply in Shropshire. The volume of additional completed and committed dwellings proposed in the village (102 dwellings at 31 March 2019) now significantly exceeds the total dwelling stock of the existing village (83 dwellings). Local aspirations for this Community Hub are for this significant new housing development to be delivered to sustain Nesscliffe as a sustainable settlement and for the community to assimilate this considerable growth.</p> <p>The community also wish to see some further small scale, windfall housing development to meet the community’s local housing needs for high quality, affordable housing. Site NES009X with a site area of less than 0.2 ha (at 0.16ha), situated in the south of the village and located within the village development boundary is considered to be a suitable site to help to meet this windfall allowance.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Site Reference: | NES009X |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | Not assessed |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | #N/A |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | #N/A |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | #N/A |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | #N/A |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | #N/A |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | #N/A |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | #N/A |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | None |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (in trees), GCNs (ponds within 250m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. The woodland edges and adjacent potential priority habitat will need to be buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | N/A |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Commercial/agricultural activity to north. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment although not much room to provide separation. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Site is located to the centre-south of Nesscliffe, with its eastern side within the development boundary. Site can only be considered in conjunction with adjacent NES017 and NES009X alone is too small (as it is less than 0.2ha). Access is only off its east side from the existing highway Medium-High Visual Impact</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p style="text-align: center;">Land within Nesscliffe development boundary</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Nesscliffe is an existing Community Hub which set out a nominal increase in its housing stock. However, the village has attracted significant demand being located close to Shrewsbury and a considerable volume of new housing has now been committed as a result of a shortfall in the housing supply in Shropshire. The volume of additional completed and committed dwellings proposed in the village (102 dwellings at 31 March 2019) now significantly exceeds the total dwelling stock of the existing village (83 dwellings). Local aspirations for this Community Hub are for this significant new housing development to be delivered to sustain Nesscliffe as a sustainable settlement and for the community to assimilate this considerable growth.</p> <p>The community also wish to see some further small scale, windfall housing development to meet the community’s local housing needs for high quality, affordable housing. Site NES009X with a site area of less than 0.2 ha (at 0.16ha), situated in the south of the village and located within the village development boundary is considered to be a suitable site to help to meet this windfall allowance.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES012 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Wilcott Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assuming the development delivers improvements to Wilcott Lane along the frontage the site including 30mph speed limit, widening and provision of a footway. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | N. Insufficient width of highway north of the site to provide a footway linking the site the village. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | None |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. The hedgerows and trees should be retained and protected. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but medium size suggests site may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation) |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with occasional boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resources within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible road noise from south. Existing commercial/agricultural to the east creating possible noise, light, odour and dusts |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Mitigate noise by location (separation distances) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site consists of part of an agricultural field located to the south of Nesscliffe. Site boundaries are defined by agricultural field boundaries to north, north-east and west. Its southern boundary is defined by a road. Its south-eastern boundary is undefined, running across an agricultural field.</p> <p>Heritage Assessment required with application</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Assuming the development delivers improvements to Wilcott Lane along the frontage of the site including 30mph speed limit, widening and provision of a footway. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p style="text-align: center;">Remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Nesscliffe is an existing Community Hub which set out a nominal increase in its housing stock. However, the village has attracted significant demand being located close to Shrewsbury and a considerable volume of new housing has now been committed as a result of a shortfall in the housing supply in Shropshire. The volume of additional completed and committed dwellings proposed in the village (102 dwellings at 31 March 2019) now significantly exceeds the total dwelling stock of the existing village (83 dwellings). Local aspirations for this Community Hub are for this significant new housing development to be delivered to sustain Nesscliffe as a sustainable settlement and for the community to assimilate this considerable growth. The community also wish to see some further small scale, windfall housing development to meet the community's local housing needs for high quality, affordable housing. Site NES009X with a site area of less than 0.2 ha (at 0.16ha), situated in the south of the village and located within the village development boundary is considered to be a suitable site to help to meet this windfall allowance.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES013 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Lane to NE of village beyond primary school. Hopton Lane? |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes site will fund appropriate estate road access and review and extension of existing 30mph with any necessary traffic calming and footway along frontage and north side of lane. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | Y. If agreement can be reached to provide a footway along the school frontage (south of the site) to link to existing footway into the village. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | None |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | A PROW runs along the western boundary. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers (record nearby) and nesting birds. The hedgerows and trees should be retained and protected. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Probable negative impact on setting of Scheduled Monument of Nesscliffe Hill Camp (NHLE ref. 1020285). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but medium size and proximity to hillfort suggests site may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of SM, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with occasional boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible road noise to north. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Glazing spec to address road noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site consists of part of an agricultural field located to the north of Nesscliffe. The sites northern and southern boundaries are defined by roads.</p> <p>Medium-High Visual Impact</p> <p>Probable negative impact on setting of Scheduled Monument of Nesscliffe Hill Camp</p> <p>Heritage Assessment required with application</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Assumes site will fund appropriate estate road access and review and extension of existing 30mph with any necessary traffic calming and footway along frontage and north side of lane.</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p style="text-align: center;">Remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Nesscliffe is an existing Community Hub which set out a nominal increase in its housing stock. However, the village has attracted significant demand being located close to Shrewsbury and a considerable volume of new housing has now been committed as a result of a shortfall in the housing supply in Shropshire. The volume of additional completed and committed dwellings proposed in the village (102 dwellings at 31 March 2019) now significantly exceeds the total dwelling stock of the existing village (83 dwellings). Local aspirations for this Community Hub are for this significant new housing development to be delivered to sustain Nesscliffe as a sustainable settlement and for the community to assimilate this considerable growth.</p> <p>The community also wish to see some further small scale, windfall housing development to meet the community’s local housing needs for high quality, affordable housing. Site NES009X with a site area of less than 0.2 ha (at 0.16ha), situated in the south of the village and located within the village development boundary is considered to be a suitable site to help to meet this windfall allowance.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES014 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 22% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 22% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 78% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 1% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 4% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 17% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium and Medium-Low |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium and Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Y. If 15/00740/OUT Proposed Residential Development Land West Of The Gables Nesscliffe provides a suitable estate road route for this development to access the former A5. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. If priority habitats not present then the protection of the Env. Network and ponds will reduce the developable area available. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. An Env. Network corridor runs through the site and adjacent. There is a pond on the site and others in close proximity to the site. If GCNs are present in any of the ponds, min. 50m buffers will be required around the ponds, reducing the developable area available. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. There are TPOs in the boundaries. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | If priority habitat, site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | Habitat could potentially be restored as priority habitat |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but medium size suggests site may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with significant boundary and field trees and hedgerows. Area of woodland adjacent to the south west boundary, TPO tree on south east boundary. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Noise from A5 to the west |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Mitigate noise by location (separation distances) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The site consists of two agricultural fields located to the west of Nesscliffe. Site boundaries to north and south are agricultural field boundaries.</p> <p>22% of the site lies within flood zone 2 and 3</p> <p>17% of the site is in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone</p> <p>An Env. Network corridor runs through the site and adjacent</p> <p>Heritage Assessment required with application</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Habitat could potentially be restored as priority habitat</p> <p>Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p style="text-align: center;">Remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Nesscliffe is an existing Community Hub which set out a nominal increase in its housing stock. However, the village has attracted significant demand being located close to Shrewsbury and a considerable volume of new housing has now been committed as a result of a shortfall in the housing supply in Shropshire. The volume of additional completed and committed dwellings proposed in the village (102 dwellings at 31 March 2019) now significantly exceeds the total dwelling stock of the existing village (83 dwellings). Local aspirations for this Community Hub are for this significant new housing development to be delivered to sustain Nesscliffe as a sustainable settlement and for the community to assimilate this considerable growth.</p> <p>The community also wish to see some further small scale, windfall housing development to meet the community's local housing needs for high quality, affordable housing. Site NES009X with a site area of less than 0.2 ha (at 0.16ha), situated in the south of the village and located within the village development boundary is considered to be a suitable site to help to meet this windfall allowance.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES015 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | No |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Former A5 through village |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund access and review and extension of existing 30mph speed limit and any necessary traffic calming. Footway needed along front of site and a pedestrian crossing facility to access footway on north side of road. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | Protection of the Env. Network will reduce the developable area available. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | There are TPO'd trees in the northern boundary. Much of the site is Env. Network corridor. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m/500m), badgers (record nearby), reptiles and nesting birds. The hedgerows and trees should be retained and protected. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | NW end of site currently occupied by ?two unoccupied early 19th century houses and associated outbuildings, which are regarded as non-designated heritage assets |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (Level 2 historic buildings assessment of historic buildings on site). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | Conserve and restore historic buildings on site. |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Significant tree cover and secondary woodland at the site. Limited development potential |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Existing commercial/agricultural to the east creating possible noise, light, odour and dusts. Possible noise from road to the north. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Mitigate noise by location (separation distances) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | If commercial on SLAA site to north possible impacts on this site and vice versa. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The sites consists of a wooded area and the northern element of an agricultural field. The site lies to the south of Nesscliffe.</p> <p>Protection of the Env. Network will reduce the developable area available</p> <p>Heritage Assessment required with application</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Assumes development will fund access and review and extension of existing 30mph speed limit and any necessary traffic calming. Footway needed along front of site and a pedestrian crossing facility to access footway on north side of road.</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement.</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p style="text-align: center;">Remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Nesscliffe is an existing Community Hub which set out a nominal increase in its housing stock. However, the village has attracted significant demand being located close to Shrewsbury and a considerable volume of new housing has now been committed as a result of a shortfall in the housing supply in Shropshire. The volume of additional completed and committed dwellings proposed in the village (102 dwellings at 31 March 2019) now significantly exceeds the total dwelling stock of the existing village (83 dwellings). Local aspirations for this Community Hub are for this significant new housing development to be delivered to sustain Nesscliffe as a sustainable settlement and for the community to assimilate this considerable growth.</p> <p>The community also wish to see some further small scale, windfall housing development to meet the community’s local housing needs for high quality, affordable housing. Site NES009X with a site area of less than 0.2 ha (at 0.16ha), situated in the south of the village and located within the village development boundary is considered to be a suitable site to help to meet this windfall allowance.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES016 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Former A5 through village |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes review and extension of existing 30mph speed limit and any necessary traffic calming is provided along with footways along site frontages on both sides of former A5. These will link with neighbouring development and continue until footway link into The Crescent on east side. Pedestrian crossing facility needed for western section of site to access the eastern side of the former A5. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | None |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers (record nearby) and nesting birds. The hedgerows and trees should be retained and protected. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible impact on setting of Scheduled Monument of Nesscliffe Hill Camp (NHLE ref. 1020285). No known archaeological interest but medium size suggests site may have some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of SM, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Agricultural land with occasional boundary trees and hedgerows. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Possible noise from road that splits the site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Mitigate noise by location (separation distances) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>The sites consists of parts of two large agricultural fields split by the main road through Nesscliffe. The site is located to the north of Nesscliffe.</p> <p>Nesscliffe. The sites northern and southern boundaries are defined by roads.</p> <p>Medium-High Visual Impact</p> <p>Heritage Assessment required with application</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Assumes review and extension of existing 30mph speed limit and any necessary traffic calming is provided along with footways along site frontages on both sides of former A5. These will link with neighbouring development and continue until footway link into The Crescent on east side. Pedestrian crossing facility needed for western section of site to access the eastern side of the former A5.</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement.</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p style="text-align: center;">Remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Nesscliffe is an existing Community Hub which set out a nominal increase in its housing stock. However, the village has attracted significant demand being located close to Shrewsbury and a considerable volume of new housing has now been committed as a result of a shortfall in the housing supply in Shropshire. The volume of additional completed and committed dwellings proposed in the village (102 dwellings at 31 March 2019) now significantly exceeds the total dwelling stock of the existing village (83 dwellings). Local aspirations for this Community Hub are for this significant new housing development to be delivered to sustain Nesscliffe as a sustainable settlement and for the community to assimilate this considerable growth.</p> <p>The community also wish to see some further small scale, windfall housing development to meet the community’s local housing needs for high quality, affordable housing. Site NES009X with a site area of less than 0.2 ha (at 0.16ha), situated in the south of the village and located within the village development boundary is considered to be a suitable site to help to meet this windfall allowance.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES017 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | Yes |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 8% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 92% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 16% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 12% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Wilcott Lane |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assuming the development delivers improvements to Wilcott Lane along the frontage of the site including 30mph speed limit, widening and provision of a footway. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | N |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | N. Insufficient width of highway north of the site to provide a footway linking the site to the village. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | None |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (in trees), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. The woodland edges and adjacent potential priority habitat will need to be buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i> | No known archaeological interest but Tithe Map appears to show cottages on part of the site in the early 19th century. Site therefore has some archaeological potential. |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological desk based assessment). |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Significant area of woodland on the south east and west boundaries. |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it allows room for retention of existing mature trees |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i> | Road noise to west and east. Commercial/agricultural activity to north. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i> | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i> | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Site is located to the S of Nesscliffe, outside of the development boundary but bordering NES009X. NES009X is dependent on this site, as alone it is too small (<0.2ha) to be considered. Access only from existing highway to east.</p> <p>Medium-High Visual Impact</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Assuming the development delivers improvements to Wilcott Lane along the frontage of the site including 30mph speed limit, widening and provision of a footway.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework and help to improve urban forest resource within the settlement.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p style="text-align: center;">Remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Nesscliffe is an existing Community Hub which set out a nominal increase in its housing stock. However, the village has attracted significant demand being located close to Shrewsbury and a considerable volume of new housing has now been committed as a result of a shortfall in the housing supply in Shropshire. The volume of additional completed and committed dwellings proposed in the village (102 dwellings at 31 March 2019) now significantly exceeds the total dwelling stock of the existing village (83 dwellings). Local aspirations for this Community Hub are for this significant new housing development to be delivered to sustain Nesscliffe as a sustainable settlement and for the community to assimilate this considerable growth.</p> <p>The community also wish to see some further small scale, windfall housing development to meet the community’s local housing needs for high quality, affordable housing. Site NES009X with a site area of less than 0.2 ha (at 0.16ha), situated in the south of the village and located within the village development boundary is considered to be a suitable site to help to meet this windfall allowance.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

Site Assessment - Stage 3

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | NES018 |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i> | No |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i> | 100% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i> | 0% |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i> | 0% |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i> | Yes |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i> | Medium-High |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i> | Former A5 through village |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i> | Assumes development will fund an appropriate estate road access and review and possibly extend the existing 30mph speed limit. Footway is in place. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i> | Y |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i> | School approx. 0.8km from site. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | Protection of pond on the site will reduce the no. of houses possible. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | There is a pond on the site. Retention and protection of the pond (with appropriate buffer) will reduce the no. of houses possible. Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers (record in the south of the field), reptiles and nesting birds. Hedgerows, trees and pond will need to be buffered. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Potential impacts on settings of Scheduled Monument of Kynaston's Cave (NHLE ref. 1006286) and Grade II listed Nesscliffe Hotel (NHLE ref. 1366938). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of SM and LB). |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | S106 monies for conservation management plan for Kynaston's Cave. |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | None |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | None |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | |
| <i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | Tree planting across site. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i> | Noise source from road at southern boundary, likely extraction/ventilation from Nesscliffe hotel may cause odour and noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i> | Noise source from road at southern boundary, likely extraction/ventilation from Nesscliffe hotel may cause odour and noise. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i> | Stand off, orientation, change in road speed, upgrading of extraction and ventilation. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i> | |
| <i>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</i> | Poor |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Considerations: | <p>Site is located to the SE of Nesscliffe immediately adjoining the Nesscliffe Hotel and situated between site NES002. Hotel and site NES018 situated outside development boundary.</p> <p>NES018 may be dependent on Hotel for vehicular access due to significant elevation of site above highway on southern frontage. Access from highway would have poor visibility to traffic approaching from west.</p> <p>NES018 is irregular shape with sloping levels to rear and to the west. Assess impacts of developing this open site on local heritage assets.</p> <p>Medium-High Visual Impact</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | <p>Assumes development will fund an appropriate highway access and possibly extend the existing 30mph speed limit. Footway is in place.</p> <p>Protection of pond on site may reduce development capacity of site.</p> <p>Noise attenuation measures required due to proximity to highway.</p> |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | <p>Tree planting opportunities across the site to ensure that development can meet tree cover targets in planning policy framework, to improve urban forest resource within the settlement and reduce the visual impacts of development.</p> |
| Potential for Windfall? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Potential for Allocation? | <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> |
| Recommendation | <p style="text-align: center;">Remain as countryside</p> |
| Reasoning | <p>Nesscliffe is an existing Community Hub which set out a nominal increase in its housing stock. However, the village has attracted significant demand being located close to Shrewsbury and a considerable volume of new housing has now been committed as a result of a shortfall in the housing supply in Shropshire. The volume of additional completed and committed dwellings proposed in the village (102 dwellings at 31 March 2019) now significantly exceeds the total dwelling stock of the existing village (83 dwellings). Local aspirations for this Community Hub are for this significant new housing development to be delivered to sustain Nesscliffe as a sustainable settlement and for the community to assimilate this considerable growth.</p> <p>The community also wish to see some further small scale, windfall housing development to meet the community’s local housing needs for high quality, affordable housing. Site NES009X with a site area of less than 0.2 ha (at 0.16ha), situated in the south of the village and located within the village development boundary is considered to be a suitable site to help to meet this windfall allowance.</p> |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |