Appendix B Albrighton Place Plan Area Site Assessments

Published: December 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:

Stage 1: Strategic Land Availability Assessment
(SLAA)

Stage 2a: Sustainability Appraisal

Additional Sites Identified Through Consultation

Stage 2b: Screening of Sites

Additional Information Gained Through Consultation

Stage 3: Detailed Assessment of Sites

Figure 1: 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.

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 sites strategic suitability was undertaken through consideration of numerous factors, including:
 - The sites consistency with the Local Plan.
 - The sites location and surroundings, including proximity to the development boundary/built form.
 - The sites 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;
 - o The sites ground conditions;
 - The ability to access the site;
 - o Flood risk to the site or its immediate access;
 - o The agricultural land quality of the site;
 - o 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:
 - o The impact on internationally and nationally designated sites and assets;
 - o The impact on important trees and woodland, including ancient woodland; and
 - o 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".

- 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:

- o The site is considered unsuitable; and/or
- o The site is considered to be unavailable; and/or
- o 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
- o There is uncertainty about the sites availability; and/or
- o 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
- o 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).
 - o 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

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

^{**}Significant natural environment/heritage constraints:

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:

- o The value/significance of any identified assets.
- o 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.

Albrighton Place Plan Area Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: Site Assessments

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: ALB002	Site Ref: ALB003	Site Ref: ALB005	Site Ref: ALB007	Site Ref: ALB008	Site Ref: ALB009	Site Ref: ALB010	Site Ref: ALB013	Site Ref: ALB014	Site Ref: ALB015	Site Ref: ALB016	Site Ref: ALB017
	Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that Special Area of Conservation	<i>арріу):</i>	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	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	Site of Special Scientific Interest	score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland	No = zero score (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
	Local Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply)):												
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation		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
2	500m of a National Nature Reserve 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland	No = zero score (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
		Yes = minus score (-)			0	0			0	0		0	0	
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app	No = zero score (0)	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	0	0	-
	Children's playground (or part) of the following (record all that app	,,,,,. 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Outdoor sports facility	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
1	Amenity green space	No = zero score (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
	Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all	that apply):						-		-			-	
	Primary School GP surgery	·	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-
5	Leisure centre	Yes = plus score (+)	T		-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
	Children's playground	No = minus score (-)	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-
	Outdoor sports facility	110 = 111111111111111111111111111111111	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+
	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	Yes = plus score (+)	+	+	+	+	+	+	_	+	+	+	+	+
	service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most	No = minus score (-) Yes = minus score (-)		·	·	·	·	·			·	·	·	·
7	versatile)	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
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
	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an	Yes = plus score (+)												
11	area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	_	0
	Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that a)	No = zero score (0)												
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Scheduled Monument	Voo – double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	a Registered Battlefield	Yes = double minus score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Registered Park or Garden	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Conservation Area	20/0 000/0 (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
	Site boundary within buffer zone ⁵ of one or more (record all that apply, 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone): 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Scheduled Monument	1 I	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0
14	300m of a Registered Battlefield	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Conservation Area	ļ [-	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	-	-	-
	300m of a Listed Building		-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	-
	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 (-)												
15	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
	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 ca	ategory is recorded												
		Overall Score	-3	1	-2	0	1	-6	-11	-2	-1	-8	-8	-6
	Range is 1 to -11 Good is 1 to -3 Fair is -4 to-7 Poor is -8 to-11 Ove	rall Sustainability Conclusion	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Good	Good	Poor	Poor	Fair

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: ALB018	Site Ref: ALB019	Site Ref: ALB020	Site Ref: ALB021	Site Ref: ALB022	Site Ref: ALB023	Site Ref: ALB024	Site Ref: P32a	Site Ref: P32b	Site Ref: P32c	Site Ref: P35	Site Ref: P36a
	Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply):													
	Special Area of Conservation		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
1	National Nature Reserve	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	Site of Special Scientific Interest	score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	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
	Local Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply)):										-		-
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	•	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
2	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	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
	100111 01 a Local Nature Neserve	Yes = minus score (-)	U	U	U	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	No = zero score (0)	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Cite contains and an array (an news) of the following 2 (record all that are													
	Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app	ny).			0	^		^	0	0		^	0	0
1	Children's playground	Voo - minus 20072 ()	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Outdoor sports facility	Yes = minus score (-)	, and the second	· ·	ŭ	0	0		0	0	-	, ,	·	U
	Amenity green space	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0		, ,	0	0	, i	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
	Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all	that apply):												
	Primary School		+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	GP surgery		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	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)		+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular	Yes = plus score (+)												
6	service offered during peak travel times ⁴ :	No = minus score (-)	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most	Yes = minus score (-)												
7	versatile)	No = zero score (0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	versaule)	Yes = minus score (-)												
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	,	No = zero score (0)												
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		No = zero score (0)			_							_		_
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
, 0		No = zero score (0)	,	Ů	Ŭ	ŭ		Ů	Ů	Ů	Ů	Ŭ		Ŭ
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an	$Yes = plus \ score \ (+)$	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 ' '	area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	Τ	U	U		"	"	"	0	U	U	0
40		Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that a													
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone		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
13	a Registered Battlefield	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
.	a Registered Park or Garden	score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Conservation Area	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	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
	Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply)).	- 	"	U	U					-	U	U	0
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone		0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0
				· ·	Ŭ	Ÿ	· ·		0		-	ŭ	·	U
1 44	300m of a Scheduled Monument	Van minus serse (1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	300m of a Registered Battlefield	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden	No = zero score (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
	300m of a Listed Building		-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for	Double minus score ()												
	residential	Double ()												
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)												
		iviii lus score (-)	<u> </u>	<u></u>			<u> </u>							<u> </u>
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high	70 (0)	_	_	_	0		_	2	4	_	^	7	0
	landscape sensitivity for residential	Zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or	DI.												
	site is inside the development boundary	Plus score (+)												
	Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca	tegory is recorded												
<u> </u>	,g. ,, g se	Overall Score	0	-11	-11	-10	-9	-8	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2
	Range is 1 to -11 Good is 1 to -3 Fair is -4 to-7 Poor is -8 to-11 Ove	rall Sustainability Conclusion		Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor
	mange to the tree dood to the total tall to the total Full to the Tree to the Tree total Full to the Tree to the Tree total Full to the Tree to	a Judiamasinty Joniciusion	, 300a	1 001	. 001	1 001	1 1001		1 001	1 001	1 001	. 001	1 001	1 001

riteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: P36b	Site Ref: P37a	Site Ref: P37b	Site Ref: P38	Site Ref: P39	Site Ref: ALB017 & ALB03
	Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that	t apply):	0	0	0	0		
	Special Area of Conservation Ramsar Site	-l	0	0	0	0	0	0
	National Nature Reserve	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	Site of Special Scientific Interest	score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wildlife Site	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Local Nature Reserve	1 I	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply	·):						
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1km of a Ramsar Site	1 I	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	500m of a National Nature Reserve	Voc. minus score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland	1V0 = 2e70 Score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	250m of a Wildlife Site	1 I	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100m of a Local Nature Reserve	1 I	0	0	0	0	0	0
_		Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that ap	piy):		0	0	0		0
4	Children's playground	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Outdoor sports facility Amenity green space	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0
		140 = 2010 Scole (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	that applyly	U	U U	U U	U U	U U	1 0
	Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all Primary School	инас арріу):		-	_	_	_	
	GP surgery	-	<u>-</u>	-	-	-	-	+
	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)	-						+
5		Von plus seers (.)	-	-	-	-	-	_
5	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)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular	Yes = plus score (+)						
6	service offered during peak travel times ⁴ :	No = minus score (-)	+	-	-	+	+	+
_	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most	Yes = minus score (-)						
7	versatile)	No = zero score (0)	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	Yes = minus score (-)		_	_	_	_	_
0	All of part of the site within a Source Frotection Zone (groundwater)	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
		Yes = minus score (-)	•	_	_	_		
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	No = zero score (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
10	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	No = zero score (0)	U	0	U	U	0	0
	Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that a	ppiy):	•					
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	<u> </u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	a Scheduled Monument	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	a Registered Battlefield	score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Registered Park or Garden	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Conservation Area	- I	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Listed Building	<u> </u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply	<i>');</i>						
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	-{	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	300m of a Scheduled Monument	Vos - minus seers ()	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 4	300m of a Registered Battlefield	Yes = minus score (-)						0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Conservation Area	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
	300m of a Listed Building Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for	Double minus esers ()	-	-	-	-	-	-
	residential	Double minus score ()						
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)						
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high	Zero score (0)	9	10	11	12	13	14
	landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or		-					1
	site is inside the development boundary	Plus score (+)						
	Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity contains the same of				4			
		Overall Score	1	0	1	2	3	-6
	Range is 1 to -11 Good is 1 to -3 Fair is -4 to-7 Poor is -8 to-11	erall Sustainability Conclusion	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Fair

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

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	ALB002
Site Address:	Land south of the railway line and north of Donington Pool, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	15.48
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	464
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Large greenfield site to the north of Albrighton. The site is in active agricultural use. The site is bounded by the railway to the north east; agricultural land to the north west; residential to the east; semi-natural open space (Donington and Albrighton LNR) to the south (with further residential development beyond); and St Cuthbert's Church and its grounds/Rectory Road to the East (with open countryside, much of which is in agricultural use beyond).
Surrounding Character:	To the north and west the character is open countryside in agricultural use, although there are also several rural dwellings on large plots and a nursery to the west. To the south and east the character is primarily residential however there is a significant boundary between the site and residential development to the south resulting from the presence of the semi-natural open space (Donington and Albrighton LNR).
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	
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.
Availability ¹ Conclusion: Size ² :	
Conclusion.	
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. A portion of the site is located in flood zones 2 and/or 3. The remaining area of the site may still have 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:	ALB003
Site Address:	Caravan storage, Station Road, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	0.22
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	6
Type of Site:	Brownfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site is currently used for the storage of caravans. It is a linear site running along the southern boundary of the railway line, opposite the railway station.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding uses include housing, the railway line and station; open countryside to the south (allocated for and subject to a Planning Application for residential development; and builders merchants to the east.
Suitability Information:	Currently Suitable
(from SLAA)	Not Currently Available - Likely to become so
Availability Information ¹ :	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific
Achievability/Viability Information:	issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
Availability Conclusion: Size ² :	:
Strategic Suitability	
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:	ALB005
Site Address:	Talbot Road, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	0.45
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	14
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Recreational amenity land surrounded by residential properties, with a narrow points of access off Bowling Green Lane; Elm Road and Delaware Avenue.
Surrounding Character:	The surrounding area is predominantly residential.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	A - 1 1 1 1 1 1
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.
Availability ¹	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³	: The majority of 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:	ALB007
Site Address:	Land to the West of Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	22.42
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	673
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site is divided into two by Bowling Green Lane. It is a large area consisting of a significant number of fields in arable/pastural use. The site also contains a sewage treatment works in its northern portion.
Surrounding Character:	The settlement of Albrighton is to the east of the site and there is a garden centre to its west. To the north are buildings associated with Cosford Airfield, beyond which is Cosford itself. To the south the character is predominantly agricultural.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	
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.
Availability ¹	:
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. Two elements of the site contain identified outdoor sports facilities. The remaining area of the site may still have 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:	ALB008
Site Address:	Land to the South of Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	11.70
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	351
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	A network of flat, small fields predominantly laid out to pasture, bounded by hedgerows and mature trees on either side of Newhouse Lane to the south of the settlement. Land also includes playing fields adjacent to Albrighton infant and junior schools.
Surrounding Character:	The surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, with agricultural fields to the south, west and east. To the north is residential development and Albrighton infant and junior schools.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	A continue to the first of the first or the
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.
Availability ¹ Conclusion: Size ² :	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding.
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. One element of the site contains identified outdoor sports facilities. The remaining area of the site may still have 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:	ALB009
Site Address:	Shrewsbury Arms, High Street, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	0.26
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	8
Type of Site:	Brownfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site contains the Shrewsbury Arms public house and a large car park.
Surrounding Character:	The site is opposite St. Mary Magdalene Church (north); Saxon Park sheltered accommodation (south), other surrounding properties are primarily residential.
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.
Availability ¹	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability 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:	ALB010
Site Address:	Land to north of Kingswood Road, south east of Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	3.31
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	99
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Level greenfield site in agricultural use to the south east of Albrighton. The site lies to the north of the A41, Kingswood Road with High House Lane running along the eastern boundary. It lies within Green Belt land, is approximately 850 metres outside of the settlement development boundary and feels divorced from the village.
Surrounding Character:	The surrounding character is agricultural.
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.
Availability ¹ Conclusion: Size ² :	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding.
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. 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:	ALB013
Site Address:	Wyvale Garden Centre, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	2.49
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	75
Type of Site:	Mixed
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	66%
General Description:	Linear site located between the Albrighton by-pass; railway line; rectory road; and Newport road. The site consists of a series of linked-units used as a garden centre; land used for the storage, display and sale of plants and other garden items; a large car-park; and a greenfield area.
Surrounding Character:	To the north, south and east land is predominantly of agricultural character. To the west land is predominantly residential (housing associated with Cosford Aerodrome).
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	
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.
Availability ¹ Conclusion: Size ² :	:
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites.
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:	ALB014
Site Address:	Land at Cross Road, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	6.41
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	192
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	A gently undulating series of agricultural fields to the south of Albrighton.
Surrounding Character:	To the north of the site is a predominantly residential part of Albrighton village. To the east of the site is Albrighton infant and primary school. To the west and south of the site are further agricultural fields. The site is located within the Green Belt.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA) Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Availability injormation :	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific
Achievability/Viability Information:	issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
Availability ¹	
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites.
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:	ALB015
Site Address:	Land at Sandy Lane, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	12.12
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	363
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	A series of agricultural fields located to the north of Albrighton, between the settlement of Albrighton and the railway line.
Surrounding Character:	Agricultural land to the east and west, there are also several rural dwellings on large plots and a nursery to the east. Railway line to the north and residential development to the south.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(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.
Availability ¹	:
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ⁵	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites.
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:	ALB016
Site Address:	Playing Field adj. Sewage Works, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	1.45
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	44
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Parcel of land containing a wooded belt, playing field and car park to the North West of Albrighton.
Surrounding Character:	Agricultural to north and east, sewage treatment works to west, and residential to south.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	
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.
Availability	
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. A significant element (50%) of the central portion of the site, including the sites access is located within flood zones 2/3. Much of 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:	ALB017
Site Address:	Land north of Kingswood Road, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	5.49
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	165
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Agricultural field to the east of Albrighton. The land has been safeguarded for future development. The site is contained between the railway line to the north and Kingswood Road to the south.
Surrounding Character:	Railway line to the north, beyond which are agricultural fields. Kingswood Road to the south, beyond which are residential dwellings. A committed housing allocation/permission to the west. An agricultural field (also safeguarded for future development) to the east.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA) Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Availability Injormation .	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific
Achievability/Viability Information:	issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
Availability	1: :
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability	3.
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:	ALB018
Site Address:	Elms Farm Land, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	29.27
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	878
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of a series of agricultural fields located within the Green Belt to the south west of Albrighton.
Surrounding Character:	Character to the south and west is predominantly agricultural, although there is also a garden centre to the west of the northern element of the site. Character to the east is predominantly residential. Character to the north is a mix of residential, agricultural and open spaces used for outdoor sports.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	
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.
Availability ¹	
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites.
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:	ALPO10
Site Reference:	ALB019
Site Address:	Land adjacent to the Depot on Cross Road, south west of Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	2.68
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	80
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of a series of small agricultural fields located to the north of the Depot on Cross Road and south west of Albrighton.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, although there is a depot located adjacent to the site and a series of large rural dwellings on large plots to the north east along Cross Road.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	Not Sultable
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.
Availability Conclusion: Size ² : Strategic Suitability	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. 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
Summary:	appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). 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:	ALB020
Site Address:	Land at the Birches, Cross Road, south west of Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	0.83
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	25
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of part of a large side and rear garden associated with a property on Cross Road, south west of Albrighton.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. Although there are several large rural dwellings on large plots in proximity of the site.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(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.
Availability Conclusion: Size ² : Strategic Suitability	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. 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
Summary:	appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). 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:	ALB021
Site Address:	Land North of Beamish Lane, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	1.04
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	31
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	A compact triangular site located to the east of Albrighton.
Surrounding Character:	Residential and agricultural.
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
rtvanasmey myörmacion :	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific
Achievability/Viability Information:	issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
Availability ¹ :	
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³ :	
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:	ALB022
Site Address:	Lea Farm Barn, south of Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	0.22
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	6
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of an agricultural barn and its small curtilage.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. Although there are isolated rural dwellings/farmhouses in proximity of the site.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(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.
Availability Conclusion: Size ² :	
	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. 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). However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding.
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:	ALB023
Site Address:	East of Harp Lane, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	0.77
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	23
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of an agricultural field located to the rear of properties on High Street.
Surrounding Character:	Character to the east and south is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north is a mix of residential and commercial. Character to the west is currently a mix of rural and residential, however the land has been allocated for residential development.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	Companilly Available
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.
Availability Conclusion: Size ² : Strategic Suitability	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. 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:	ALB024
Site Address:	Land east of Shaw Lane, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	1.73
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	52
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Agricultural field bounded by school playing fields to the north, residential property curtilages to west and south and a hedgerow containing significant numbers of mature trees to the east.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding land uses include residential, open space associated with the school and agricultural (some of which has been allocated for residential development).
Suitability Information:	N/A
(from SLAA)	
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.
Availability	1 _:
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability	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 Assessment - Stage 2b		
Site Reference:	P32a	
Site Address:	Land between the Albrighton By-Pass and the Railway Line, north east of Albrighton	
Settlement:	Albrighton	
Site Size (Ha):	4.92	
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	148	
Type of Site:	Mixed	
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	Approx. 50%	
General Description:	The site consists of a linear parcel of land bounded by the Albrighton By-Pass to the north and the railway line to the south. The site includes an area of green space; a travellers site consisting of a large area of hardstanding with associated buildings; and farm buildings.	
Surrounding Character:	Character to the north and east is predominantly agricultural. Character to the west is commercial. Character to the south is agricultural, however these agricultural fields are a mix of land allocated for residential development and safeguarded for future development.	
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable	
(from SLAA)	Not Sultuble	
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.	
Availability ¹ : Conclusion: Size ² :	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding.	
Strategic Suitability ³ :	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites.	
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:	D22b
Site Reference:	P32b
Site Address:	Land to the west of Quarry Leasow Barn, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	1.22
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	37
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The sites consists of a number of small agricultural fields located between the Albrighton By-Pass, the Railway Line, Quarry Leasow Barn and Rectory Road.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	
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.
Availability ¹	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding.
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. 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:	P32c
Site Address:	Land between the Albrighton By-Pass and the Railway Line, north of Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	4.07
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	122
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of a series of agricultural fields defined by the Albrighton By-Pass and the railway line. The sites extent is also defined by the location of a series of rural dwellings/farmhouses and their curtilages.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, although there are also a number of rural dwellings/farmhouses in proximity.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(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.
Availability ¹	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding.
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. 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:	P35	
Site Address:	Land south of Albrighton Hall, Albrighton	
Settlement:	Albrighton	
Site Size (Ha):	38.60	
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	1158	
Type of Site:	Greenfield	
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A	
General Description:	An extensive irregularly shaped site consisting of a large number of agricultural fields located to the south of Albrighton Hall and the settlement of Albrighton itself.	
Surrounding Character:	Character to the south, west and east is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north is a mix of residential dwellings (of various density), land allocated for residential development or safeguarded for future 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.	
Availability ¹ Conclusion: Size ² :	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the	
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites.	
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	1
Site Reference:	P36a
Site Address:	Land located between Cross Road, Patshull Road and Holyhead Road, south west of Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	23.23
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	697
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Triangular site formed by Cross Road, Patshull Road and Holyhead Road consisting of a series of agricultural fields of varying sizes.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. However residential dwellings within Albrighton are located to the north east of the site.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	
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.
Availability ¹ Conclusion: Size ² :	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding.
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites.
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	T and
Site Reference:	P36b
Site Address:	Land at Lea Hall, South of Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	56.29
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	1689
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	A very large and irregularly shaped site consisting of numerous agricultural fields. The site is separated from the built form of the settlement by further agricultural land.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	Not suituble
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.
Availability ¹ Conclusion: Size ² :	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding.
5120	
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. 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:	P37a
Site Address:	Land north of Holyhead Road and east of Green Lane, south west of Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	12.20
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	366
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Relatively large parcel consisting of three agricultural fields located to the south west of Albrighton and separated from the settlement by another large agricultural field. The site is bordered by Green Lane to the west, Holyhead road to the south and Cross Lane to the south east. Other boundaries are agricultural field boundaries.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural, although there are a limited number of large rural dwellings on large plots in proximity of the site.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	
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.
Availability ¹ Conclusion: Size ² :	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding.
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. 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:	P37b
Site Address:	Land north east of Kennel Lane, south west of Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	12.72
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	382
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Large, irregularly shaped site consisting of a series of agricultural fields to the south west of Albrighton.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding uses include agriculture, horticulture/garden centre, sewage treatment works, public open space, and a limited number of rural dwellings/farmhouses.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	A continue to the first of the first or the
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.
Availability ¹ Conclusion: Size ² :	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding.
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. 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:	P38
Site Address:	Land North of Loak Road, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	0.36
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	11
Type of Site:	Mixed
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	Approx. 10%
General Description:	Rectangular site located north of Loak Road, east of Albrighton Allotments, west of a row of houses on Worthington Drive and south of the playing fields and sludge tanks off Worthington Drive. The site consists of a grassed field, an area of scrubland which previously contained a building, and an area of hardstanding. The site has an informal footpath across it, linking Loak Road and Worthington Drive.
Surrounding Character:	Character to the south and east is predominantly residential. To the north and west is a mix of open space and the sewage treatment works and associated land.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	
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.
Availability ¹ : Conclusion: Size ² :	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding.
Strategic Suitability ³ :	The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites.
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:	P39
Site Address:	Land east of Rectory Road and south of the railway line, Albrighton
Settlement:	Albrighton
Site Size (Ha):	4.33
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	130
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of an agricultural field located to the south of the railway line and east of Rectory Road. The site is separated from the built form of Albrighton by agricultural fields and the Donington Pool Local Nature Reserve.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is predominantly open countryside in agricultural use, although there is also several rural dwellings on large plots and a nursery to the south of the site farm buildings/farmhouse to the north of the site.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	THOI SUITUBLE
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.
Availability ¹ Conclusion: Size ² : Strategic Suitability ³	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding. The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. 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.

Albrighton Place Plan Area Stage 3 Detailed Site Review: Site Assessments

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALB002
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	
Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	1%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	2%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	98%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year	
surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	
surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	
surface flood risk zone:	3%
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:	6%
All or part of the site within a Source	
Protection Zone:	Yes
FTOLECTION ZONE.	
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the impact on the setting of the historic settlement and encroachment on the countryside. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm.
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Υ
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	N
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable?	Y. Subject to a check on the capacity of Rectory Road and consideration of a shared highway network with ALB015 & P39 which would allow westbound traffic to access the Newport Rd via ALB015. This group of sites could accommodate 957 homes.
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service):	18
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	Buffering the southern and eastern boundaries and the pond will reduce the developable area available.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	Donington & Albrighton LNR lies adjacent to the southern boundary. The potential impacts on the LNR will need to be assessed and it will need to be adequately buffered. The southern and eastern boundaries form an Environmental. Network corridor.
	There is a pond on the. Should GCNs be present, a min. 50m buffer will be required. Requires EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, otters, water voles (known to be present), white-clawed crayfish, invertebrates and nesting birds
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Possible effects on settings Grade II* St. Cuthbert's Church (NHLE ref. 1273838), associated Scheduled Monument and Grade II* Listed churchyard cross (NHLE refs. 1015301 & 1239196), and Albrighton Conservation Area. Some metal detectorist finds and large size of site suggests it has some archaeological potential
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs, archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	mature trees and hedges around site and copses of woodland within site. Strip of woodland continuous with Donnington Pool along southern boundary
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Ensure sufficient development stand-off from Donnington Pool and woodland.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Incorporate central wooded copse in open space and plant to connect to / expand adjoining wooded areas.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Railway line to the north causing noise. Possible noise from RAF Cosford which may need assessment. Old farm buildings on site and historic map shows features which may present contamination of the land
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings plus boundary treatment as necessary to the rail. Noise assessment and suitable glazing and ventilation if issues with aircraft noise found. Remediation likely to be available for any contaminated land that may be found.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Good
	Land has been safeguarded for future development to the east of Albrighton, although it is recognised that there is a need to ensure that there remains land safeguarded for development beyond the current plan period. This site is in the Green Belt to the north of the built form of the settlement. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4.
Strategic Considerations:	The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the impact on the setting of the historic settlement and encroachment on the countryside. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. This site contains significant trees and hedgerows. It is also located within the gap between Albrighton and Cosford. Furthermore the noise generated at Cosford Airfield may require mitigation. Capacity of local highway network (Rectory Lane) and access would require assessment and potentially improvement to accommodate development. This may require land outside the promoted site to be achieved, including land in third party ownership. Whilst the site is relatively well related to the built form of the settlement it adjoins and is separated from the bulk of the built form of the settlement by a local nature reserve (which also has local amenity and landscape value). The site also adjoins a conservation area and other heritage assets. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 46

Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	A suitable buffer would be required to southern and eastern boundaries to mitigate and manage impacts on adjoining Local nature reserve. Capacity of local highway network (Rectory Lane) and access would require assessment and potentially improvement to accommodate development. This may require land outside the promoted site to be achieved, including land in third party ownership. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Opportunity for high quality tree planting and creation of links into/between existing wooded areas. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation?	No Patricia de Caraca Patr
Recommendation	Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm. The site is also separated from the built form of the settlement by a Local Nature Reserve, in proximity to numerous heritage assets and within the gap between Cosford and Albrighton.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALB003
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	Voc
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	0%
surface flood risk zone:	V /V
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	0%
surface flood risk zone:	···
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	0%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	0%
Historic Flood Map:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	0%
historic flood event:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	0%
detailed river network:	
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	Yes
FIOLECTION ZONE.	
Green Belt* Considerations:	N/A
(from the GB Assessment/Review)	N/A
Landscape Considerations:	
	Not assessed
(from the LVSS)	
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Not assessed
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	Assuming access will be permitted via private road to Railway Station onto Station Road.
How?	Assuming access will be permitted via private road to hanway station onto station houd.
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Υ
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway	
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	Assuming small number of dwellings
Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	Assuming small number of dwellings due to limitations of the Railway Station access road junction onto Station Road.
Site Works remevable:	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	20
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	20
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	
Significant Constraints:	None
3 7	

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The railway line forms an Env. Network corridor. Requires EcIA and surveys for GCNs (ponds within 500m), bats, badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Hedgerows will need to be buffered.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	Site immediately adjacent to and likely to have an negative affect upon the setting of II Listed station buildings (NHLE refs. 1221627)
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	site bordered by hedgerows
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey & Tree Protection Plan
Tree Comments Opportunities:	no trees on site - enhance tree cover within site, to deliver net gain for biodiversity.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Noise assessment required for rail noise and commercial noise and odour from existing restaurant. The site is possibly viable as long as mitigation on the rail facing façade such a s gables or walls which are uninterrupted by windows or internal layout of dwelling so non habitable rooms are facing away from rail track.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Good
Appraisal: Strategic Considerations:	The site is not located within the Green Belt. It is located within the existing built form of Albrighton, with clearly defined site boundaries. The capacity of the site is likely to be limited to a small number of houses given limitations of the Railway Station access road junction onto Station Road. Site immediately adjacent to and likely to have an negative affect upon the setting of II Listed station buildings (NHLE refs. 1221627). The site is adjacent to the railway line which will have noise implications, there is also an environmental network alongside the railway line. Hedgerows along northern and southern boundaries. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 49

Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Capacity of local highway network (access onto Station Road) would need to be reflected when determining scale of any development. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Retain and enhanced hedgerows. 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	Potential for windfall development
Reasoning	The site is already located within the development boundary of Albrighton. It is relatively small and its capacity is constrained by the highway access. Any potential for windfall development is subject to such factors as the assessment and ability to appropriately manage any impact on the impact on the adjacent grade II Listed station buildings and their settings, effective mitigation of noise from the railway line, retention of hedgerows and enhancement of the environmental network.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

N/A

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALB007
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	Yes
Agricultural Land Quality:	Tes
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	0%
surface flood risk zone:	0,0
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	0%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	1%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	00/
historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	2%
detailed river network:	2/0
All or part of the site within a Source	Yes
Protection Zone:	
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within two different Green Belt parcels. The northern element of the site is located within a parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2, purpose 3 and purpose 4. The southern element of the site is located within a parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; and moderately against purpose 3 and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within two different Green Belt parcels. The release of the parcel containing the northern element of the site would have a low-moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. The release of the parcel containing the southern element of the site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to encroachment on the countryside and weakening of the role of neighbouring areas of Green Belt. No sub-parcels were identified with less harm.
Landscape Considerations:	were identified with less nath.
(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?	
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. An improved Bowling Green Lane (eastern end) would need to incorporated into the highway layout of the overall site. Links with ALB018 would need to be provided.
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	N
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable?	Y. This site is likely to significantly increase traffic on the western end of Bowling Green End and improvements may require third party land. The impact on the eastern end of Bowling Green Lane and junction with Newport Rd (linked with ALB018) is likely to be unacceptable but subject to a detailed assessment. This could be reduced if a strategic road connection can be made between Worthington Dr Loak Road, through P38.
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service):	17
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	If priority habitats are present then those areas should not be developed. The pond/priority habitats /watercourse/hedgerows should be appropriately buffered, reducing the developable area available.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. There are ponds on/adjacent to the site. If GCNs are present then a min. 50m will be required. The northern boundary forms an Environmental. Network corridor, due to the presence of a watercourse. A PROW crosses the site. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
Opportunities: Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Possible impact on setting of Grade II listed Shifnal Manor (The Manor House - NHLE ref. 1176147). No known archaeological interest but large size of site also suggests it may have other archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs, archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities: Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints: Tree Comments	
Other Constraints:	mature trees and hedges around site boundaries and occasional trees within site.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Incorporate internal trees in open space and plant to connect to / expand adjoining strip of woodland to the north.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Possible noise from RAF Cosford which may need assessment. Sewage works to the north east of the site creating odour. Potential for land contamination with historic features noted on the site and unknown filled ground
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Noise assessment and suitable glazing and ventilation if issues with aircraft noise found. Significant stand off distance from sewage treatment works recommended. Remediation likely to be available for any contaminated land that may be found.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Good
Appraisal:	
Strategic Considerations:	Land has been safeguarded for future development to the east of Albrighton, although it is recognised that there is a need to ensure that there remains land safeguarded for development beyond the current plan period. This site is in the Green Belt to the west of and only partly adjoining the settlement boundary. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within two different Green Belt parcels. The northern element of the site is located within a parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2, purpose 3 and purpose 4. The southern element of the site is located within a parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; and moderately against purpose 3 and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within two different Green Belt parcels. The release of the parcel containing the northern element of the site would have a low-moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. The release of the parcel containing the southern element of the site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. The release of the parcel containing the southern element of the site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to encroachment on the countryside and weakening of the role of neighbouring areas of Green Belt. No sub-parcels were identified with less harm. There is concern about the ability to provide an appropriate access to the site and the capacity of the wider road network. Resolving these issues may involve third party land. The site is located within the gap between Albrighton and Cosford Airfield. The site is located within the gap between Albrighton and Cosford Airfield may require mitigation. The site is adjacent to a sewage treatment works and in proximity of ecological and heritage assets which will require due consideration. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary pr
	Page 52

Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Local highway network (in particular Bowling Green Lane) and access are not satisfactory and would require improvement to accommodate development requiring land outside the promoted site to achieve this. Any priority habitats should be retained. Identified areas of open space should be retained and enhanced. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Site could be restored/improved to provide a priority wildlife habitat and enhance environmental network. Opportunity for high quality tree planting and creation of links into/between existing wooded areas. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation? Recommendation	No Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The local highway network and access are constrained. Part of the site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALBOO8
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	No
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Yes
Agricultural Land Quality:	
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	10/
surface flood risk zone:	1%
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:	4%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	0%
Historic Flood Map:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	0%
historic flood event:	078
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	20/
detailed river network:	3%
All or part of the site within a Source	
Protection Zone:	Yes
rotection zone.	
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; and moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the critical role the parcel plays in preserving the setting of the historical settlement area within Albrighton. Whilst a sub-parcel was identified with a reduced harm, this did not include the land promoted within this site.
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
,	
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	γ
Highway Network?	
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	
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 access will be within the improved section of Newhouse La otherwise Lane improvements will need to be extended further from Albrighton.
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Y
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable?	Y. Capacity of Rectory
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service):	21
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	If priority habitats are present then those areas should not be developed.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. The eastern boundary borders an Environmental. Network. A PROW crosses the site. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site partially within Shifnal Conservation Area. Includes non designated historic farmstead of Mere House (HER PRN 27973) . No known archaeological interest but site is of a large size, so may have some archaeological potential
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance and setting of CA; Level 2 historic building assessment of historic farmstead if demo proposed; archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	north-east of site in conservation area. TPO trees on northern boundary.
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	trees, groups of trees and hedges within and around site and strip of woodland to part of eastern boundary.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Ensure reasonable development stand-off form woodland.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Incorporate good trees and tree groups as part of open space within development.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Some noise from the school but generally not expected to be an issue unless there is plant and equipment that may make noise and impact on proposed dwellings.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Noise assessment and appropriate stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to any noise source.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	
Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	There is safeguarded land to the east of Albrighton intended to make provision for settlement development needs. This site is in Green Belt to the south of the settlement. As the sites availability is currently unknown, the site is not considered suitable for allocation. However it may have potential for future safeguarding. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; and moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the critical role the parcel plays in preserving the setting of the historical settlement area within Albrighton. Whilst a sub-parcel was identified with a reduced harm, this did not include the land promoted within this site. The site is well related to the built form of Albrighton, close to services and facilities including the primary school. Part of the site is within Albrighton Conservation Area this is therefore a significant consideration, particularly with regard to design quality. The site also has some significant trees and may contain priority habitats. These factors will also require due consideration. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 55

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:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. Opportunity for high quality tree planting to form the focus for open space provision on the site. 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 Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The sites availability is currently unknown. The site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALB013
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
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	10070
surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	
surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	
surface flood risk zone:	4%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	
Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	
	0%
historic flood event:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	0%
detailed river network:	
All or part of the site within a Source	Yes
Protection Zone:	
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2, purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have a low level of harm on the Green Belt.
Landscape Considerations:	Lavo and Madissa
(from the LVSS)	Low and Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	Laurand Madirus
(from the LVSS)	Low and Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	Υ
Highway Network?	
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Υ
Development at the Access Point?	
·	
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway	
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	
Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the	V V
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Associability Parity (Out Co	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	17
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	If wievity habitate are museout them these areas about the developed
Significant Constraints:	If priority habitats are present then those areas should not be developed.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	If priority habitat, the 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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	site sandwiched between main road and railway.
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	belts of trees to site boundaries
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Thin site needs careful attention to shading and other constraints posed by trees.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Significant road and rail noise likely. Possible land contamination from past land use.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Noise assessment and appropriate stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to any noise source plus boundary treatment as necessary.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Good
<i>Арргизиі.</i>	
Strategic Considerations:	Land has been safeguarded for future development to the east of Albrighton, although it is recognised that there is a need to ensure that there remains land safeguarded for development beyond the current plan period. This site is in the Green Belt to the north of Albrighton, adjacent to the built form of Cosford. The site is separated from Albrighton by other land and the railway line. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2, purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have a low level of harm on the Green Belt. Much of the site has already been developed and forms part of the settlement of Cosford. The remainder of the site lies in the gap between Cosford and Albrighton. The site is not well related to the built form of Albrighton and it may therefore be more appropriate to consider in the context of Cosford. As the site is sandwiched between the A41 and the railway line, the impact of noise on residential amenity would be a significant consideration. The site contains wooded belts along its boundaries and may also contain priority habitats, which would require due assessment/management. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 58

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:	Site could be restored/improved to provide a priority wildlife habitat and enhance environmental network. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation? Recommendation	No Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The sites location sandwiched between the railway line and A41 and the associated noise is a significant consideration for residential development. The site is divorced from the built form of Albrighton (this separating land is considered to form part of a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm). It may therefore be more appropriate to consider in a Cosford context.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALB014
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:	3%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	
surface flood risk zone:	7%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	
surface flood risk zone:	40%
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:	24%
All or part of the site within a Source	
Protection Zone:	Yes
Steetion Zone.	
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that whilst the wider parcel within which this site is located would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt, the site has been identified within a sub-parcel which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt, as it is well contained and considered to have characteristics of the settlement edge.
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	
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?	
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):	20
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	If priority habitats are present then those areas should not be developed.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	Some of the boundaries form Environmental. Network corridors. These should be retained and buffered. The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. There is a pond adjacent to the north-western boundary. Should GCNs be present, a min. 50m buffer will be required. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	If priority habitat, the 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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site contains earthwork remains of ridge and furrow (HER PRN 33238). Large size of site suggests it may hold other archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	TPO trees to eastern boundary
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	trees and hedgerows within and around site
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Potential road noise from roads to the north, west and east.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings plus boundary treatment as necessary to the road.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	Land has been safeguarded for future development to the east of Albrighton, although it is recognised that there is a need to ensure that there remains land safeguarded for development beyond the current plan period. This site is in the Green Belt to the south and adjoining the built form of Albrighton. The site is well related to the built form of Albrighton adjoining the primary school and close to services and facilities. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that whilst the wider parcel within which this site is located would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt, the site has been identified within a sub-parcel which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt, as it is well contained and considered to have characteristics of the settlement edge. The site has some significant trees on and in proximity; archaeological interest; parts are within an environmental network; and there may be priority habitats. These factors will require due consideration. A small portion of the site is located within the 30 year and 100 year surface flood risk zones, whilst 40% of the site is located within the 1,000 year surface flood zone. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 61

Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	A small portion of the site is in areas at higher risk of surface water flooding, this will need to be assessed and managed. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Site could be restored/improved to provide a priority wildlife habitat and enhance environmental network. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation? Recommendation	No Remove from the Green Belt and safeguard for future development.
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. However, the site is located within a sub-parcel which has been identified as having a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt, as such it is considered an appropriate location to remove from the Green Belt and safeguard for future development beyond the current plan period. Removing land from the Green Belt is subject to identification of exceptional circumstances, this will be detailed within a Green Belt: Exceptional Circumstances Statement.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity: If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALB015
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	
Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	1%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	2%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	98%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year	
surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	
surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	
surface flood risk zone:	3%
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
Tratection Zone.	
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the impact on the setting of the historic settlement and encroachment on the countryside. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm.
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	
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. Assumes primary access onto Newport Road where the existing speed limit will need to be extended with appropriate traffic calming.
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):	19
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	Buffering the southern boundary may reduce the developable area available.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	Donington & Albrighton LNR lies adjacent to the southern boundary. The potential impacts on the LNR will need to be assessed and it will need to be adequately buffered. Requires EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, otters, water voles (known to be present), white-clawed crayfish, invertebrates and nesting birds
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	
Heritage Comments	
Significant Constraints: Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Possible effects on settings Grade II* St. Cuthbert's Church (NHLE ref. 1273838), associated Scheduled Monument and Grade II* Listed churchyard cross (NHLE refs. 1015301 & 1239196), and Albrighton Conservation Area. No known archaeological interest but site is of a large size, so may have some archaeological potential
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs & CA, archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints: Tree Comments Other Constraints:	mature trees and hedgerows within and around site. Block of mature trees adjacent eastern boundary and woodland continuous with Donington Pool to south.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Fine trees in northern section could be focal points in open space within any development. Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the woodland to the south and east
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Road noise from road to the west of the site. Rail noise to the north of the site.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings plus boundary treatment as necessary to the road and rail.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Poor
Appraisal:	
Strategic Considerations:	Land has been safeguarded for future development to the east of Albrighton, although it is recognised that there is a need to ensure that there remains land safeguarded for development beyond the current plan period. This site is in the Green Belt to the north of and only partly adjoining the settlement boundary. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the impact on the setting of the historic settlement and encroachment on the countryside. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. This site contains significant trees and hedgerows. It is also located within the gap between Albrighton and Cosford (noise generated at Cosford, adjacent roads and railway lines may require mitigation). Whilst the site is relatively well related to the built form of the settlement it is separated from the bulk of the built form of the settlement by a local nature reserve (which also has local amenity and landscape value). The site also adjoins a conservation area and other heritage assets. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site performs poorly in Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 64

Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Buffer would be required to southern and eastern boundaries to mitigate and manage impacts on adjoining LNR. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Site could enhance environmental network. Existing trees on the northern portion of the site could form a focus for any open space provision. Trees could also provide buffers to the south and east of the site. 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 Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm. The site is also separated from the built form of the settlement by a Local Nature Reserve, in proximity to numerous heritage assets and within the gap between Cosford and Albrighton.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALB017
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
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:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	
surface flood risk zone:	1%
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:	Yes
Green Belt* Considerations:	The site consists of land previously removed from the Green Belt and safeguarded for future development.
(from the GB Assessment/Review)	
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Y
Development at the Access Point?	
	Assumes the development found a suitable set-to-mode source to the site and the set of t
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway	Assumes the development fund a suitable estate road access to the site and a review and extension of the existing 30mph
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	speed limit with associated traffic calming. In order to address potential safety concerns related to the bend in Kingswood
Reasonably be Made So?	Road a roundabout junction access should be considered which replaces the need for the existing Kingswood Road / Beamish
,,	Lane priority junction.
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	
	Assumes vehicular and pedestrian links will be provided to the adjacent allocated development site to the west of the site to
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	facilitate sustainable travel to the village facilities and local access. Also assumes a review of the A41 / Beamish Lane junction
Site Works Achievable?	and consideration of closure.
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	11
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	None
Significant Constraints:	

Ecology Comments	The northern boundary forms an Environmental. Network corridor. This must be buffered. There is a pond on the site - if this
Other Constraints:	contains GCNs then a min. 50m buffer will be required. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	No known archaeological interest but site is of a large size, so may have some archaeological potential
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	hedgerow and trees to northern boundary. Group of trees within site. Mature trees at southern access with Kingswood Road
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Rail to the north of the site.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings plus boundary treatment as necessary to the rail.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Fair
Appraisal: Strategic Considerations:	The site is located to the east of Albrighton within land safeguarded for future development. The site is adjacent to the Albrighton development boundary, directly adjoining an allocated housing site, and would be well related to the future built up extent of the settlement. The site forms part of an environmental network and there are significant trees and hedgerows present, these will need due consideration. The site may be subject to other ecological and heritage interests which would need to be evaluated as part of any development scheme. Highways and noise impacts associated with the adjoining railway line would need to be fully assessed and managed. Impact on the A41 / Beamish Lane junction also needs to be assessed. Existing road network and access will require improvement to accommodate development. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.

Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Traffic calming and extension of 30mph speed limit necessary. Need to consider capacity of junction of Beamish Lane with A41. Buffering of the railway line. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Site could enhance environmental network. The site should integrate into the existing built form of the settlement and the developments occurring on adjacent sites. Strategic links through the site and into the adjacent development site required - vehicular/cyclist/pedestrian and green infrastructure/environmental networks. 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 development alongside ALB021.
Reasoning	The site is well related to the settlement within an area of safeguarded land identified to meet Albrighton's future development requirements and is a natural direction for expansion.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	ALB017 & ALB021 Total: 180 dwellings
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	Comprehensive masterplan required for ALB017 and ALB021. Design and layout will ensure vehicular, cyclist and pedestrian access from ALB017 into ALB021. Contributions to jointly required infrastructure will be proportional, based on the level of development forecast. Any necessary improvements to the local and strategic road network will be undertaken, informed by consultation with Highways England and an appropriate Transport Assessment (including consideration of cumulative impact). An appropriately designed roundabout will be provided on Kingswood Road at the point of access into the site. The 30mph zone on Kingswood Road will be extended to reflect the extent of the site and the impact on Beamish Lane/A41 junction assessed and mitigated. This will likely involve closure of this junction. To enhance access to services and facilities in the town and achieve integrated communities, the development will include a northern and southern vehicular, cyclist and pedestrian connection into the saved SAMDev Allocation ALB002. Opportunities to provide on-site public car parking facilities, to alleviate pressure on existing facilities, should be considered. Green infrastructure will be provided through the site and link into the wider area. This provision will include an appropriate green buffer of the railway line and the associated green infrastructure corridor. The pond on ALB017 will be appropriately assessed and managed (opportunity to integrate into open space provision). Where possible trees and hedgerows on the site should be retained and enhanced, supported by positive tree planting, particularly on areas of open space. 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.

N/A

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALB018
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
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:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	
surface flood risk zone:	1%
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:	Yes
Trocedion Zone.	
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; and moderately against purpose 3 and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to encroachment on the countryside and weakening of the role of neighbouring areas of Green Belt. No sub-parcels were identified with less harm.
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	A. P.
(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?	
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. An improved Green Lane would need to incorporated into the highway layout of the overall site. Along with major junctions on the A464 and Elm Road. Links with ALB007 would need to be provided.
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	N
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable?	Y. Cross Road / Elm Road junction would need to be assessed for improvements. The impact on the eastern end of Bowling Green Lane and junction with Newport Rd (linked with ALB007) is likely to be unacceptable but subject to a detailed assessment. This could be reduced if a strategic road connection can be made between Worthington Dr Loak Road, through P38.
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service):	17
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	If priority habitats are present then those areas should not be developed. The pond/priority habitats/hedgerows should be appropriately buffered, reducing the developable area available.

The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required.
There are ponds on/adjacent to the site. If GCNs are present then a min. 50m will be required. A PROW crosses the site. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds
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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
Possible impacts on settings of Grade II listed The Old Windmill (NHLE ref. 1053693), The Elms (NHLE ref. 1053692) and Barn 60m SE of The Elms (NHLE ref. 1367612). Tithe Map indicates that a brickfield present in one part of site, and together with its large size, suggests that it may have archaeological potential.
Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs, archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
mature trees and hedgerows around site boundaries and along internal lanes. Copse of trees in northern corner of site
Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Design open space to integrate with existing good trees.
Road noise to the edge of the site to the north and east.
Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings plus boundary treatment as necessary to the road.
Good
Land has been safeguarded for future development to the east of Albrighton, although it is recognised that there is a need to ensure that there remains land safeguarded for development beyond the current plan period. This site is in the Green Belt to the south-west of the settlement boundary. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; and moderately against purpose 3 and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to encroachment on the countryside and weakening of the role of neighbouring areas of Green Belt. No sub-parcels were identified with less harm. This is a very large site which comprises several land parcels. Whilst the site adjoins the development boundary to the east, due to its size it does project into the countryside to the south-west of the settlement. There is concern about the ability to provide an appropriate access to the site and the capacity of the wider road network. Resolving these issues may involve third party land. The site contains some significant trees and hedgerows and is in proximity to listed buildings. It may also contain priority habitats and be of archaeological interest. These factors will require due consideration. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.

Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Local highway network and access are not satisfactory and would require improvement to accommodate development requiring land outside the promoted site to achieve this. This would include improvements to Green Lane and junctions with A464, Elm Road and potentially a new road connection through P38. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation? Recommendation	No Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning If proposed for Allocation Potential	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The local highway network and access are constrained. The site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALB019
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
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	40/
surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	40/
surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	CD/
surface flood risk zone:	6%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	0%
Historic Flood Map:	U%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	00/
historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	0%
detailed river network:	U%
All or part of the site within a Source	Yes
Protection Zone:	res
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; and moderately against purpose 3 and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to encroachment on the countryside and weakening of the role of neighbouring areas of Green Belt. No sub-parcels were identified with less harm.
Landscape Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	Mediditi
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	THE COLUMN
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	γ
Highway Network?	
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	N
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway	
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	Y. Existing speed limit needs to be extended.
Reasonably be Made So?	
,	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	
S.C. VVOINS NOTICE VUDICE	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	13
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed.
Significant Constraints:	The pond, tees and hedgerows should be appropriately buffered, reducing the developable area available.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. There is a pond on the site. If GCNs are present then a min. 50m will be required. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	If priority habitat, the 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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	TPO tree on north-eastern corner of site.
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	trees and hedgerows to north-east, south-east and south-west boundaries and around pool near eastern corner of site.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Commercial land to the south, road noise from the east.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings plus boundary treatment as necessary to the road and commercial land.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Door
Appraisal:	Poor
Strategic Considerations:	Land has been safeguarded for future development to the east of Albrighton, although it is recognised that there is a need to ensure that there remains land safeguarded for development beyond the current plan period. This site is in the Green Belt to the south-west of the settlement boundary. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; and moderately against purpose 3 and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to encroachment on the countryside and weakening of the role of neighbouring areas of Green Belt. No sub-parcels were identified with less harm. This site in isolation is not well related to the built form of Albrighton being divorced from the development boundary. The site has some significant trees and hedgerows, including a TPO, and there may be priority habitats. These factors will require detailed consideration. Noise impacts from nearby roads and adjoining commercial uses would need to be assessed and managed. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site performs poorly in Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 73

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:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation? Recommendation	No Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The site is isolation is poorly related to the built form of the settlement (separating land is considered to form part of a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm). The site itself is also considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALB020
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
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	100%
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	
	0%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	4%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	0%
Historic Flood Map:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	0%
historic flood event:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	0%
detailed river network:	0 /0
All or part of the site within a Source	Yes
Protection Zone:	163
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; and moderately against purpose 3 and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to encroachment on the countryside and weakening of the role of neighbouring areas of Green Belt. No sub-parcels were identified with less harm.
Landscape Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	A.A. P
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	V
Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
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?	
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):	14
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. The trees and hedgerows should be appropriately buffered, reducing the developable area available.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. There is a pond on the site. If GCNs are present then a min. 50m will be required. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	If priority habitat, the 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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	TPO tree at road frontage to site.
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	mature trees and hedges around site boundaries.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees
Tree Comments Opportunities:	
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Road noise to the south east boundary
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings plus boundary treatment as necessary to the road
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Dear
Appraisal:	Poor
Strategic Considerations:	Land has been safeguarded for future development to the east of Albrighton, although it is recognised that there is a need to ensure that there remains land safeguarded for development beyond the current plan period. This site is in the Green Belt to the south-west of the settlement boundary. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; and moderately against purpose 3 and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to encroachment on the countryside and weakening of the role of neighbouring areas of Green Belt. No sub-parcels were identified with less harm. This site in isolation is not well related to the built form of Albrighton being divorced from the development boundary. The site has some significant trees and hedgerows, including a TPO, and there may be priority habitats. These factors will require detailed consideration. Noise impacts from nearby roads and adjoining commercial uses would need to be assessed and managed. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site performs poorly in Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 76

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:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation? Recommendation	No Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The site is isolation is poorly related to the built form of the settlement (separating land is considered to form part of a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm). The site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity: If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALB021
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
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
Green Belt* Considerations:	The site consists of land previously removed from the Green Belt and safeguarded for future development.
(from the GB Assessment/Review)	The site consists of land previously removed from the Green belt and suregulated for lattice development.
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	N
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway	
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	Y. Beamish La is not suitable for additional development traffic. However, if linked to ALB017 and Beamish La was improved
Reasonably be Made So?	or ALB 021 had vehicular access to Kingswood Rd via ALB 017 then the site could be developed.
neusonably be widde so:	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	N
Works?	N .
	Y. If vehicular and pedestrian links are achieved to the adjacent development site (ALB017) to facilitate sustainable travel to
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	the village facilities and prevent additional traffic on Beamish Lane which is currently unsuitable for additional traffic. Also
Site Works Achievable?	
	assumes a review of the A41 / Beamish Lane junction and consideration of closure.
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	15
Transport Service):	
mansport servicej:	
Ecology Comments	None
Significant Constraints:	Hone

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The northern boundary forms an Environmental. Network corridor. This must be buffered. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Opportunities: Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints: Tree Comments	mature trees along northern boundary and hedgerows to south-west and east boundaries.
Other Constraints: Tree Comments	
Management of Constraints:	development stand-off from trees along northern boundary.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	tree planting to enhance tree cover on site.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Rail to the north of the site and road to the east.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings plus boundary treatment as necessary to the road and rail.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Poor
Appraisal:	
Strategic Considerations:	The site is located to the east of Albrighton within land safeguarded for future development. The site is separated from the Albrighton development boundary by another promoted site (ALB017), which forms the remainder of the safeguarded land. The site forms part of an environmental network and there are significant trees and hedgerows present, these will need due consideration. The site may be subject to other ecological interests which would need to be evaluated as part of any development scheme. Highways and noise impacts associated with the adjoining railway line would need to be fully assessed and managed. Existing road network and access will require improvement to accommodate development. Impact on the A41 / Beamish Lane junction also needs to be assessed. Highways and noise impacts associated with the adjoining railway line would need to be fully assessed and managed. The site performs poorly in Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Assessment. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
-	

	Traffic calming and extension of 30mph speed limit necessary. Need to consider capacity of junction of Beamish Lane with A41.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to	The existing road network and access off Beamish Lane is not satisfactory and will require improvement to accommodate
make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	development, potentially by seeking access via ALB017 to Kingswood Road.
	Buffering of the railway line.
	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.
	See comments from relevant service areas.
	Site could enhance environmental network. Opportunity for high quality tree planting. The site should integrate into the existing built form of the settlement and the developments occurring on adjacent sites.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Strategic links through the site and into the adjacent development site required - vehicular/cyclist/pedestrian and green infrastructure/environmental networks.
••	This site should also be considered in the context of ALB017 - to ensure a rational approach to development and the
	provision of infrastructure.
	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 development alongside ALB017.
Reasoning	The site is well related to the settlement within an area of safeguarded land identified to meet Albrighton's future development requirements and is a natural direction for expansion. Whilst the site performs poorly within Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Assessment process, this is primarily due to access to services and facilities. Enhancing access from the site to the services and facilities available within the town can be achieved through development of the site (in combination with ALB017). Furthermore additional green infrastructure provision can be achieved through development of the site (in combination with ALB017).
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	ALB017 & ALB021 Total: 180 dwellings
capacity.	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	Comprehensive masterplan required for ALB017 and ALB021. Design and layout will ensure vehicular, cyclist and pedestrian access from ALB017 into ALB021. Contributions to jointly required infrastructure will be proportional, based on the level of development forecast. Any necessary improvements to the local and strategic road network will be undertaken, informed by consultation with Highways England and an appropriate Transport Assessment (including consideration of cumulative impact). An appropriately designed roundabout will be provided on Kingswood Road at the point of access into the site. The 30mph zone on Kingswood Road will be extended to reflect the extent of the site and the impact on Beamish Lane/A41 junction assessed and mitigated. This will likely involve closure of this junction. To enhance access to services and facilities in the town and achieve integrated communities, the development will include a northern and southern vehicular, cyclist and pedestrian connection into the saved SAMDev Allocation ALB002. Opportunities to provide on-site public car parking facilities, to alleviate pressure on existing facilities, should be considered. Green infrastructure will be provided through the site and link into the wider area. This provision will include an appropriate green buffer of the railway line and the associated green infrastructure corridor. The pond on ALB017 will be appropriately assessed and managed (opportunity to integrate into open space provision). Where possible trees and hedgerows on the site should be retained and enhanced, supported by positive tree planting, particularly on areas of open space. 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.

N/A

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALB022
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
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	Yes
Protection Zone:	
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt.
Landscape Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	Mediani
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	
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 visibility standards at access point onto A464 being acceptable.
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):	9
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	None

Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/ lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Environmental. Network in accord Environments Opportunities: Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: Requires EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m), badgers and nesting birds. Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/ lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Environmental. Network in accord Environmental Networks and MD12. Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: N/A	_
Other Constraints: Requires EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m), badgers and nesting birds. Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/ lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Environmental. Network in accord Environmental Networks and MD12. Ecology Comments Opportunities: Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: Heritage Comments N/A	_
Other Constraints: Requires EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m), badgers and nesting birds. Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/ lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Environmental. Network in accord Environmental Networks and MD12. Ecology Comments Opportunities: Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: Heritage Comments N/A	_
Lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Environmental. Network in accord Environmental Networks and MD12. Ecology Comments	_
Lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Environmental. Network in accord Environmental Networks and MD12. Ecology Comments	_
Lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Environmental. Network in accord Environmental Networks and MD12. Ecology Comments	_
Management of Constraints: Innes and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Environmental. Network in accord Environmental Networks and MD12. Ecology Comments Opportunities: Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: Heritage Comments N/A	dance with CS17
Environmental Networks and MD12. Ecology Comments Opportunities: Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: Heritage Comments	
Opportunities: Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: Heritage Comments	
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: Heritage Comments N/A	
Heritage Comments	
N/A	
N/A	
Heritage Comments N/A	
Management of Constraints:	
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities: Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments	
Other Constraints:	
Tree Comments	
Management of Constraints:	
Tree Comments	
Opportunities: no trees or hedges on site. Opportunity to enhance cover through tree / hedge planting as part of a lands	scape scheme
Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments	
Other Constraints: Possible land contamination having noted a feature on the site.	
Public Protection Comments Remediation likely.	
Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2g Sustainability	
Appraisal:	
There is safeguarded land to the east of Albrighton intended to make provision for settlement development	needs. This site
is in Green Belt to the south of the settlement.	
As the sites availability is currently unknown, the site is not considered suitable for allocation. However it may for future safeguarding.	ay have potential
for future safeguarding. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt p	parcel which
performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4.	
Strategic Considerations: The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site	would have a
high level of harm on the Green Belt. The site is separated from the built form of the settlement.	
The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered	d.
The site performs poorly in Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Assessment.	
The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best	and most
versatile agricultural land.	
Page 82	

Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Traffic calming and extension of 30mph speed limit necessary. Need to consider capacity of junction of Beamish Lane with A41. The existing road network and access off Beamish Lane is not satisfactory and will require improvement to accommodate development, potentially by seeking access via ALB017 to Kingswood Road. Buffering of the railway line. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Site could enhance environmental network. Opportunity for high quality tree planting. The site should integrate into the existing built form of the settlement and the developments occurring on adjacent sites. Strategic links through the site and into the adjacent development site required - vehicular/cyclist/pedestrian and green infrastructure/environmental networks. This site should also be considered in the context of ALB017 - to ensure a rational approach to development and the provision of infrastructure.
	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	See comments from relevant service areas. No
Potential for Allocation?	No No
Recommendation	Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning If proposed for Allegation, Detaption	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm. The site is separated from the built form of the settlement by land which is also located within the Green Belt, release of which would also have high harm.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

*Green Belt Purposes (where applicable):

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	ALB023
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
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	10070
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	0%
historic flood event:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	0%
detailed river network:	
All or part of the site within a Source	Yes
Protection Zone:	
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; and moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the critical role the parcel plays in preserving the setting of the historical settlement area within Albrighton. Whilst a sub-parcel was identified with a reduced harm, this did not include the land promoted within this site.
Landscape Considerations:	A.A. dissess
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	AA P
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	Assumed via Harp La
How?	
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 capacity / safety checks are made on the use of Harp Lane
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):	23
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. The eastern boundary borders an Environmental. Network. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site wholly within Albrighton Conservation Area.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance and setting of CA).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	V high design quality required.
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	within conservation area
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	mature trees to north and west boundaries, hedge to south and strip of woodland to eastern boundary.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees. Ensure reasonable development stand-off from woodland.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	Good sight, no known constraints at this time.
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Cood
Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	There is safeguarded land to the east of Albrighton intended to make provision for settlement development needs. This site is in Green Belt to the south of the settlement. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; and moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the critical role the parcel plays in preserving the setting of the historical settlement area within Albrighton. Whilst a sub-parcel was identified with a reduced harm, this did not include the land promoted within this site. The site is well related to the built form of Albrighton, close to services and facilities including the primary school. The site is wholly within Albrighton Conservation Area this is therefore a significant consideration, particularly with regard to design quality. The site also has some significant trees and may contain priority habitats. These factors will also require due consideration. The site has a very constrained road access via Harp Lane which will also serve the adjoining allocated site, Land at White Acres (ALB003) which has been identified to deliver retirement housing. It is unclear whether Harp Lane would have sufficient capacity to serve additional development. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 85

Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	It is unclear whether Harp Lane would have sufficient capacity to serve additional development. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation? Recommendation	No Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Sike Reference: Occord Authority Reference Area? Mineral softgruperring Area? No Mineral softgruperring Area? No Mineral softgruperring Area? No Appricational cand Quality: Precencing of site in Flood 2 noe 3: Precencing of the site in Intel 2 no year surface Flood in Six sone: Precencing of the site in Intel 2 no year surface Flood in Six sone: Precencing of the site in Intel 2 no year surface Flood in Six sone: Precencing of the site in Intel 2 no year surface Flood in Six sone: Precencing of the site in Intel 2 no year surface Flood in Six sone: Precencing of the site in Intel 2 no year surface Flood in Six sone: Precencing of the site in Intel 2 no year surface Flood in Six sone: Precencing of the site in Intel 2 no year surface Flood in Six sone: Precencing of the site in Intel 2 no year surface Flood in Six sone: Precencing of the site in Intel 2 no year surface Flood in Six sone: Precencing of the site in Intel 2 no year surface Flood in Six sone: Precencing of the site in Intel 2 no year surface Flood in Six sone: Precencing of the site in Intel 2 no year surface Flood in Six sone: No Six sone Six sone Six sone Flood in Six sone: No Six sone Six sone Six sone Flood in Six sone: No Six sone Six sone Six sone Six sone Six sone No Six sone Six sone Six sone Six sone No Six sone Six s	Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Cool Authority Reference Area? Whelly or Petryl, Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Apricultural Land Quality: Precentage of six in Flood 20ne 2: Precentage of six in Flood 20ne 3: Precentage of six in Flood 20ne 2: Precentage of six in Flood 20ne 3: Precentage of six in Flo		AI B024
Mineral Sofeguarding Area? No Wholly or Partly Goods 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of set in Hood 2 one 3: Percentage of set in Hood 2 one 2: Percentage of set in Hood 2 one 2: Percentage of the site in the 30 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 100 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Sofree Flood Tisk one: Sofree Flood Tisk o		
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Lond Duelly: Percentage of site in 1800d 20ne 3: Percentage of site in 1800d 20ne 2: Percentage of site in 1800d 20ne 2: Percentage of site in 1800d 20ne 1: Percentage of site site site site site site site site		
Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood 2 mae 3: Percentage of site in Flood 2 mae 2: Percentage of site in Flood 2 mae 2: Percentage of site in Flood 2 mae 2: Percentage of the site in Bod 2 mae 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 years surface Plood 1 kits none: Percentage of the site in the 100 years surface Plood 1 kits none: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Plood 1 kits none: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Plood 1 kits none: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Plood 1 kits none: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Plood 1 kits none: Percentage of the site site in the 1,000 year surface Plood 1 kits none: Percentage of the site site site of the EA Hostoric Flood 4 Mae: Percentage of the site site site 2 mae 1 kits none: Percentage of the site within 20 m of an Instancia Plood year. Percentage of the site within 20 m of an Instancia Plood year: Percentage of the site within 20 m of a detailed vive a network: All or part of the site within 3 Source Protection Zone: Ves Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) Not Assessed Via fleid gate access to Shaw Lane Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Not Assessed Via fleid gate access to Shaw Lane Hoghway Comments - If suiting Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development of the Access Point? No Development of the Access Point? No Percentage of the Source Provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. No Percentage of the Source Provision of the Current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. No Percentage of the Source Provision of the Current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. No Percentage of the Source Provision of the Current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane.		
Percentage of site in Flood Zane 3: Percentage of Site in Flood Zane 2: Percentage of Site in Flood Zane 2: Percentage of Site in Flood Zane 2: Percentage of Site in Flood Zane 3: Percentage of Site Site Site Site Site Site Zane 3: Percentage of Site Site Site Site Site Site Site Site		Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the site in Body Zone 1: Percentage of the site in Body Zone 1: Percentage of the site in Body Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 years suffice Plood its Xone: Percentage of the site in the 100 years suffice Plood its Xone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year suffice Plood its Xone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year suffice Plood its Xone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year suffice Plood its Xone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year suffice Plood its Xone: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic Plood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic Plood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic Plood event: Percentage of the site within 3 Source Protection Zone: Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) Individual Protect Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) Not Assessed Individual Protect Considerations: (from the USS) Not Assessed Indipulsely Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - String Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development of the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development of the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-		Λ%
Percentage of Site in Fload Zone 1: Percentage of Site in Fload Zone 1: Percentage of the Site in the 30 year surface Fload risk zone: Percentage of the Site in the 30 year surface Fload risk zone: Percentage of the Site in the 1,000 year surface Fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Fload risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an Antonic Fload within 20m of an O% Historic Fload within 20m of an O% Historic Fload within 20m of an O% Historic Fload within 35 wore Precentage of the site within 20m of an O% Historic Fload with the Source Not Assessed Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Highway Comments - Use Xisting Highway At Access Point is Not Suitable, Con it Reasonably be Made So? Not Assessed Highway Comments - Use Xisting Highway At Access Point is Not Suitable, Con it Reasonably be Made So? Not Assessed Not		
Percentage of the site in the 30 years surface flood site some: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood site some: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood site some: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood site some: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood site some: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood site some: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood site some: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood site some: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood site some: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood site some site site site site site site site sit	,	
Surface (Pool risk zone: Percentage of the stein in the 100 year Surface (Pool risk zone: Percentage of the stein in the 1,000 year Surface (Pool risk zone: Percentage of the stein in the 1,000 year Surface (Pool risk zone: Percentage of the steil intention of an Initiatio (Pool deset): Percentage of the steil within 20 m of an Initiatio (Pool deset): Percentage of the steil within 20 m of a detailed river network: All or port of the site within 20 m of a detailed river network: All or port of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) N/A Green Belt* Considerations: (from the USS) Not Assessed (from the USS) Not Assessed Highway Consments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Access Point is Not Suitable, Con It Reasonably be Made So? N There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	J ,	
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk scene: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk scene: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 30m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 30m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 30m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 30m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 30m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood revert. Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood r		1%
Surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Statelies Flood High Be Actives And Highway Comments - If Existing Highway At Access Point Is Not Suitable, Can It Reassanably be Made So? No There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the Cases Soint Is Not Suitable, Can It Reassanably be Made So? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Statelies For Triffic Associated with the Development of the Access Point? Highway Comments - Other Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Other Could the Development Court Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Other Court of the Site without off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Other Court of the Court of t		
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface [Boat As Some: Percentage of the site udentified on the EA Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic Flood Magn. Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic Flood went: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic Flood went: Percentage of the site within 20m of on detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of on detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) Landscape Considerations: (from the USS) Not Assessed Visual Impact Considerations: (from the USS) Not Assessed Yes Inflyway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Inflyway Comments - J No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Inflyway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Not Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Not Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Not Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Not Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Not Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Not Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Not Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Not Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Not Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Not Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Not Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Not Access Point is Not Suitable for Not Point Provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane.		1%
Surface (Bood risk zone: Percentage of the site dientified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of on Nistoric Flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of on Nistoric Flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a decidied wher network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Green Belt * Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) Indicated the protection of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indicated the protection of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indicated the protection of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indicated the protection of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indicated the protection of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indicated the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indicated the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indicated the site within a Source Protection of the Source Protection of the Source Protection Zone Indicated The So		
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic Flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: From the GB Assessment/Review) All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: If the LVS		2%
Historic Fload Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic fload event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed file network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: Not Assessed Visual Impact Considerations: Not Assessed Visual Impact Considerations: Visual Impact Considerations: Not Assessed Visual Impact Considerati		
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Green Belt * Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) Indiangual Considerations: (from the USS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the USS) Not Assessed Iffrom the USS) Not Assessed Wisual Protect Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Detwork? Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can one Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Fixisting Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Not There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. Highway Comments - Could the Development Cocur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Could the Development Cocur Without Off-Site Works?		0%
historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Yes Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? N There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Y Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	•	
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Yes Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Not Assessed Not Assessed Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Not Assessed Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Not Asse		0%
detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) Landscape Considerations: (from the USS) Intel LVSs) Not Assessed Yes Not Assessed Yes Not Assessed Yes Not Assessed Yes Not Assessed If you the LVSs) Not Assessed Yes Not Assessed Yes Not Assessed Yes Not Assessed Yes Not Assessed Not Assessed Yes Yes Not Assessed Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y		
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Wisual impact considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Fixed Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Suitable for Troffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - Sting Highway Suitable for Troffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made 50? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - Sting Highway In There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-		0%
From the GB Assessment/Review) Landscape Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) Not Assessed Not Assessed Not Assessed Waul Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Fix No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Nighway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Not Assessed Yia field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Assessed Not Assessed Yia field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Assessed Not Assessed		
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Not Assessed Yessual impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? N There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?		Yes
(from the GB Assessment/Review) Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Assessed Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Sacciated with the Development at the Access Point? Not Sacciated with the Development occur Without Off-Site Works? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - Oculd the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Protection zone:	
(from the GB Assessment/Review) Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Assessed Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Sacciated with the Development at the Access Point? Not Sacciated with the Development occur Without Off-Site Works? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - Oculd the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?		
(from the GB Assessment/Review) Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Assessed Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Sacciated with the Development at the Access Point? Not Sacciated with the Development occur Without Off-Site Works? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - Oculd the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?		
(from the GB Assessment/Review) Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Assessed Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Sacciated with the Development at the Access Point? Not Sacciated with the Development occur Without Off-Site Works? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - Oculd the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?		
(from the GB Assessment/Review) Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Assessed Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Via field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Field gate access to Shaw Lane Not Sacciated with the Development at the Access Point? Not Sacciated with the Development occur Without Off-Site Works? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - Oculd the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Green Belt* Considerations:	
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed Not Assessed Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? N There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Not Assessed N There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane.		N/A
Section Considerations: Section Section Considerations: Section Section Considerations: Section Section Considerations: Section	The second secon	
Section Considerations: Section Section Considerations: Section Section Considerations: Section Section Considerations: Section		
Section Considerations: Section Section Considerations: Section Section Considerations: Section Section Considerations: Section		
Section Considerations: Section Section Considerations: Section Section Considerations: Section Section Considerations: Section		
(from the LVSS) Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Not Assessed Y Highway Comments - Existing Highway In the Indiana Access to Shaw Lane N N N N N N N There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	Landscape Considerations:	Not Assessed
Ifrom the LVSS Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Y	(from the LVSS)	NOT ASSESSED
If the LVSS Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Y	Visual Impact Considerations:	Not Assessed
Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? N There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	(from the LVSS)	Not Assessed
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Note There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	Highway Comments - Direct Access to	V
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Note the Indiana Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Note the Indiana Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Note the Indiana Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Note the Indiana Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Note the Indiana Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development Society of the Indiana Suitable for Indiana	Highway Network?	'
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? N There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? N There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	Via field gate access to Shaw Lane
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? N There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Without Off-Site Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	How?	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? N There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Without Off-Site Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	Highway Commonto Frinting Highway	
Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? N There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-		
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? N There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access with associated footway provision in the land available from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-		N
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Note the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane.	Development at the Access Point?	
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Note the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane.		
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Note the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane.		
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Note the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane.	Highway Comments - If Existing Highway	
Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-		
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-		from the current field gate access. Also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane.
Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	,	
Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-		
Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	Highway Comments - Could the	
Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-		V
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-		l '
	Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	Site Works Achievable?	
Lighway Accessibility Pating (Out Of	Highways Associability Best (Oct 25	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of		
24) (Based on Primary School, GP		23
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public		
Transport Service):	iransport Service):	
Ecology Comments	Ecology Comments	
NODE	Leology comments	
	Significant Constraints:	None

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The railway line forms an Env. Network corridor. Requires EcIA and surveys for GCNs (ponds within 500m), bats, badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Hedgerows will need to be buffered.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site access falls within the Albrighton Conservation Area. Possible effect of setting of Grade II Meeson Hall (NHLE ref. 1053697). Archaeological remains of a former windmill (HER PRN 05365) may be present towards the southern end of the site.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance and setting of CA and LB; archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	site fringed to east, south and west boundaries with belts of TPO trees
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees
Tree Comments Opportunities:	enhance tree cover within site, to deliver net gain for biodiversity.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Poor
Appraisal: Strategic Considerations:	The site is not located within the Green Belt. The site consists of a large field with well defined field boundaries. There are residential dwellings to west and south, land to the east is currently allocated for residential development and to the north is the school and associated playing fields. The site is currently only accessible via a field gate access onto Shaw Lane. There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access in this location and it is also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. However, an alternative access could potentially be achieved through the adjacent development site (to the east of this site), any such access would need to have due regard of trees along site boundaries. The site is bounded by substantial belts of TPO'd trees to east, west and south. The existing site access falls within the Albrighton Conservation Area. Possible effect of setting of Grade II Meeson Hall and the site may also have archaeological potential. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site performs poorly in Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 88

Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	The site is currently only accessible via a field gate access onto Shaw Lane. There is insufficient width to achieve an estate road vehicle access in this location and it is also unlikely to be able to deliver a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. However, an alternative access could potentially be achieved through the adjacent development site to the east of this site), any such access would need to have due regard of trees along site boundaries. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	Yes
Potential for Allocation?	No No
Recommendation	Potential for windfall development
Reasoning	The site is located within the development boundary. Any potential for windfall development is subject to identification and provision of an appropriate vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access. The current potential point of access is significantly constrained due to the width of available land, which means an appropriate access is unlikely to be achievable, and the limited ability to achieve a suitable junction onto Shaw Lane. However, an alternative access could potentially be achieved through the adjacent development site (to the east of this site), although any such access would be subject to highway approval and would need to have due regard of trees along site boundaries. Whilst the site performs poorly within the Sustainability Appraisal this is primarily due to access to services and facilities. Development could provide enhanced access to services and facilities and on-site green infrastructure. In addition to the above factors, any potential for windfall development is also subject to factors such as appropriate enhancement of site boundaries, due consideration of heritage assets in the area and the protection and integration of TPOs along site boundaries.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

N/A

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	P32a
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	Yes
Agricultural Land Quality:	163
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	1%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	2%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	4%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	0%
Historic Flood Map: 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
	The Croop Belt Assessment undertaken for Shrenchire indicates that this site is legated within a Croop Belt narrel which
Croon Bolt* Considerations	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which
Green Belt* Considerations:	performs weakly against purpose 2 and purpose 3; and moderately against purpose 4.
(from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the sub-parcel containing this site would have
	a low-moderate level of harm on the Green Belt.
Landscape Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	Mediani
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	у
Highway Network?	,
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Υ
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway	
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	
Reasonably be Made So?	
,	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	
Site Works Helife Vubic;	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	12
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	
Significant Constraints:	If priority habitats are present then those areas of the site should not be developed, reducing the developable area available.
	<u>l</u>

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The southern boundary forms an Environmental. Network corridor. This must be buffered. There is a pond on the site - if this contains GCNs then a min. 50m buffer will be required. The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	mature hedgerows within and around site and trees to southern boundary.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	plant large, long-lived trees within site open space as part of a quality landscape scheme.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Noise from A41 and railway.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings plus boundary treatment as necessary to the rail and road.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	There is safeguarded land to the east of Albrighton intended to make provision for settlement development needs. This site is in Green Belt to the east of the settlement. As the sites availability is currently unknown, the site is not considered suitable for allocation. However it may have potential for future safeguarding. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2 and purpose 3; and moderately against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the sub-parcel containing this site would have a low-moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. The site is bounded by the Albrighton By-Pass and railway line (noise associated with these features will require due consideration). Whilst the site is adjacent to the built form of the settlement/land safeguarded for future development, it is some distance from the majority of the services and facilities in the settlement. The site is located within a parcel with medium landscape and visual impact for housing and medium-high impact for employment. The site also contains some significant trees/hedgerows and may contain priority habitats. These factors will require due consideration. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 91

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:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. Opportunity for high quality tree planting to form the focus for open space provision on the site. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation? Recommendation	No Remove from the Green Belt and safeguard for future development.
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The sites availability is currently unknown. Due to the sites location, bounded by the Albrighton By-Pass and Railway Line and separated from the services and facilities available within the settlement by these physical features, it is likely that future use for employment purposes will be considered most appropriate. Removing land from the Green Belt is subject to identification of exceptional circumstances, this will be detailed within a Green Belt: Exceptional Circumstances Statement. These uses would need to complement existing uses on the site and in the surrounding area.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	P32b
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	Yes
Agricultural Land Quality:	
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	0%
surface flood risk zone: 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	00/
detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source	Yes
Protection Zone:	Tes
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2 and purpose 3; and moderately against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt.
Landscape Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	··· ····
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
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?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Υ
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):	13
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. The southern boundary forms an Environmental. Network corridor. The hedgerows/tree lines should be buffered. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	If priority habitat, the 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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Opportunities: Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints: Tree Comments	
Other Constraints:	mature trees to north and west boundaries
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Smallish site needs careful attention to shading and other constraints posed by trees.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Noise from A41 and railway. Farm to the east creating possible noise, odours, dust.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings plus boundary treatment as necessary to the rail and road. As this is a rather small site and noise sources surround it mitigation may be difficult or constrain the amount of development that can take place.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Fair
Appraisal: Strategic Considerations:	There is safeguarded land to the east of Albrighton intended to make provision for settlement development needs. This site is in Green Belt to the north of the settlement. As the sites availability is currently unknown, the site is not considered suitable for allocation. However it may have potential for future safeguarding. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2 and purpose 3; and moderately against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. The site is bounded by the Albrighton By-Pass and railway line (noise associated with these features will require due consideration). The site is separated from the built form of the settlement by the railway line and other land. It is also some distance from the majority of the services and facilities in the settlement. The site also contains some mature trees and may contain priority habitats, these factors will require due consideration. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 94

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.
	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. 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 Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The sites availability is currently unknown. The site is separated from the built form of the settlement by the railway line and other land (separating land is considered to form part of a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm).
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	P32c
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	
Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	12%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	15%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	85%
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:	12%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	
surface flood risk zone:	21%
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:	6%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	Yes
רוטנפננוטוו בטוופ.	
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2 and purpose 3; and moderately against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt.
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Υ
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
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):	12
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	If priority habitats are present then those areas of the site should not be developed, reducing the developable area available. The Environmental. Network corridor/tree lines/hedgerows/scrub/ditch should be retained and buffered, reducing the developable area available.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. The eastern section of the site and southern boundaries are Environmental. Network corridor. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	If priority habitats, 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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Possible impact on setting of Scheduled Monument of Moated site 330m south west of Humphreston Hall (NHLE ref. 1019203). Medium sized site in proximity to a moated site suggests that it may have some archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (setting assessment, archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints: Tree Comments Other Constraints:	mature trees and hedgerows to site boundaries. North-west corner of site is constrained by mature trees and south-east by narrowness and scrub woodland
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	plant large, long-lived trees within site open space as part of a quality landscape scheme.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Noise from A41 and railway.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings plus boundary treatment as necessary to the rail and road.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Fair
Appraisal:	
Strategic Considerations:	There is safeguarded land to the east of Albrighton intended to make provision for settlement development needs. This site is in Green Belt to the north of the settlement. As the sites availability is currently unknown, the site is not considered suitable for allocation. However it may have potential for future safeguarding. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2 and purpose 3; and moderately against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. The site is bounded by the Albrighton By-Pass and railway line (noise associated with these features will require due consideration). The site is separated from the built form of the settlement by the railway line and other land. It is also some distance from the majority of the services and facilities in the settlement. 15% of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3, this is the element of the site most closely associated with the built form of Albrighton. 8% of the site is located within the 30 year surface flood zone, 12% within the 100 year surface flood risk zones and 21% within the 1,000 year surface flood zone. The site also contains some mature trees; may contain priority habitats; and is adjacent to a scheduled monument. These factors will require due consideration. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 97

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:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. Opportunity for high quality tree planting to form the focus for open space provision on the site. 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 Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The sites availability is currently unknown. The site is separated from the built form of the settlement by the railway line and other land (separating land is considered to form part of a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm). The element of the site is closest proximity to the built form of the settlement is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. The site is adjacent to a scheduled monument.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment);

Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	P35
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	
Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	2%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	3%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	97%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year	3770
surface flood risk zone:	10%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	
surface flood risk zone:	14%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	
surface flood risk zone:	28%
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	18%
detailed river network:	
All or part of the site within a Source	Yes
Protection Zone:	
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. However, a sub-parcel has been identified which would result in a moderate level of harm to the Green Belt, this sub-area represents an element of this site.
Landscape Considerations:	A.A. H
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	AA P
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	V
Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
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?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	N
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable?	Y. This site could accommodate 1,158 homes and the impact on the highway in the vicinity could be very significant. In particular it will be necessary to assessments the A41 bypass junction (eastern end). However, the site should have the financial capacity to afford all necessary mitigation. Two access points onto Kingswood Road will need to be created and traffic from the centre of the site should be able to reach both access points. This would also enable public transport to be potentially re-routes through the site from Kingswood Road. Excellent pedestrian and cycle provision, including links to ALB008 and the school are critical to minimising single occupancy car traffic generated by the site.
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service):	21
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	The developable area is much reduced by the presence of the Environmental. Network (and its associated habitats).

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	Much of the site is Environmental. Network core habitat or corridors. The Environmental. Network must be retained and enhanced. There are ponds on/adjacent to the site and a ditch/drain along the southern boundary. The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. There are PROWs and TPOs on the site. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats (buildings, trees and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, white-clawed crayfish, otters, water voles, invertebrates, reptiles and nesting birds.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	Environmental. Network and priority habitats must 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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Parts of the site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat.
Heritage Comments	Habitat connectivity and POS could be enhanced.
Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site partially within Shifnal Conservation Area. Includes part of non-designated historic parkland for Albrighton Hall and also has potential to impact on setting of non-designated Albrighton Hall. Some metal detectorist finds and large size of site suggests it has some archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance and setting of CA; impacts on non-designated parklands and setting of Albrighton Hall; archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	north-western part of site in conservation area. Strip of TPO woodland projects into central northern part of site.
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	mature trees and groups of trees and hedges around and throughout site.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees
Tree Comments Opportunities:	large area of land so affords opportunity to integrate existing trees and groups of trees within a matrix of open space and natural habitat.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Road noise to the east, particularly from the A41. Possible noise from Albrighton Hotel.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings plus boundary treatment as necessary to the road and hotel noise.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Fair
Appraisal:	1.5
Strategic Considerations:	There is safeguarded land to the east of Albrighton intended to make provision for settlement development needs. This site is in Green Belt to the south of the settlement. As the sites availability is currently unknown, the site is not considered suitable for allocation. However it may have potential for future safeguarding. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. However, a sub-parcel has been identified which would result in a moderate level of harm to the Green Belt, this sub-area represents an element of this site. Development of the entirety of the site would result in the need for an assessment of the eastern end of the A41 By-Pass junction; two access points onto Kingswood Road (this would also allow for public transport to be re-routed); and excellent pedestrian/cyclist links. 10% of the site is located within the 30 year surface flood zone, 14% within the 100 year surface flood risk zones and 28% within the 1,000 year surface flood zone. The site contains environmental networks, which must be retained/enhanced. The site contains ponds and may contain priority habitats; part of the site is located within a conservation area; the site also includes part of a non-designated historic parkland and could impact on the setting of the non-designated Albrighton Hall; there are trees subject to TPO protection; and mature trees and hedgerows on the site. For the sub-area of the site it is expected that these factors will require proportional consideration, although some issues may only apply to the wider site. For the sub-area of the site it is expected that these factors will require proportional consideration, although some issues may only apply to the wider site. The

Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Development of the entirety of the site would result in the need for an assessment of the eastern end of the A41 By-Pass junction; two access points onto Kingswood Road (this would also allow for public transport to be re-routed); and excellent pedestrian/cyclist links. For the identified sub-area, these requirements would need to be proportional to the scale of development proposed. Flood risk (FZ2 and/or 3) relates to SW corner of parcel. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. Opportunity for high quality tree planting to form the focus for open space provision on the site. 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	Remove the identified sub-area from the Green Belt and safeguard for future development.
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The sites availability is currently unknown. The site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm. However, a sub-parcel has been identified which would result in a moderate level of harm to the Green Belt, this sub-area represents an element of this site. Removing land from the Green Belt is subject to identification of exceptional circumstances, this will be detailed within a Green Belt: Exceptional Circumstances Statement. The wider site contains designated and undesignated heritage assets, however these are considered to be focused outside the identified sub-parcel. The site contains ecological assets, however the majority of which are outside the identified sub-parcel. The wider site would require significant highway improvements, these would need to be provided proportional to the level and impact of development on the sub-parcel.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	P36a
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
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	100%
surface flood risk zone:	5%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	
surface flood risk zone:	7%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	
surface flood risk zone:	15%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	
Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	0%
historic flood event:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	7%
detailed river network:	
All or part of the site within a Source	Yes
Protection Zone:	
Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt.
Landscape Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	Weddill
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	Wedulii
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	Green Provide Provide Wall Provide Annual Provide
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	Cross Road Patshull Road Holyhead Road
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Υ
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	Assumes development will fund site frontage improvements along Cross Road and Patshull Road, including widening, provision of footway and extension of speed limits. Also assumes development will fund review and improvements at three junctions - Holyhead Road / Cross Road, Holyhead Road / Patshull Road and Cross Road / Patshull Road. The extent of these reviews and improvements will be dependent upon the layout of the development and decisions on the most appropriate access points for a development of potentially 696 homes. A new access onto Holyhead Road may be appropriate.
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	
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):	17
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	Reduction in developable area available due to presence of ponds.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	An Environmental. Network corridor (a ditch) runs through part of the site. There are a number of ponds on the site. Ponds (priority habitat) should be retained, buffered and connectivity increased, which will reduce the developable area available. If GCNs are present in any of the ponds, buffers of at least 50m are likely to be required. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (in trees), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. The hedgerows will need to be appropriately buffered.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	No known archaeological interest but site is of a large size, so may have some archaeological potential
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	hedgerows and mature trees and groups of trees around and within site
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	use 20% canopy cover policy to plant trees and woodland within site. large area of land so affords opportunity to integrate existing trees and groups of trees within a matrix of open space and natural habitat.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Road noise to the boundaries of the site. Commercial operation to the northwest creating possible noise, dusts, odour.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	
Appraisal:	Fair
Strategic Considerations:	There is safeguarded land to the east of Albrighton intended to make provision for settlement development needs. This site is in Green Belt to the south of the settlement. As the sites availability is currently unknown, the site is not considered suitable for allocation. However it may have potential for future safeguarding. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. 5% of the site is located within the 30 year surface flood zone, 7% within the 100 year surface flood risk zones and 15% within the 1,000 year surface flood zone. Whilst the sites northern point is adjacent to the built form of the settlement, the site generally has a poor relationship to the built form of Albrighton and projects into the countryside. The site may have archaeological potential. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 103

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? Recommendation	No Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The sites availability is currently unknown. The site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm. The site is poorly related to the built form of the settlement.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	P36b
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
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	100//
surface flood risk zone:	1%
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:	10%
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	3%
detailed river network:	
All or part of the site within a Source	Yes
Protection Zone:	
Green Belt* Considerations:	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4.
(from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt.
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	Patshull Road Newhouse Lane Holyhead Road
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Υ
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	Assumes development will fund site frontage improvements along Newhouse Lane and Patshull Road, including widening, provision of footway and extension of speed limits. Also assumes development will fund review and improvements at four junctions - Holyhead Road / Patshull Road, Cross Road / Patshull Road, Newhouse Lane / Holyhead Road and Newhouse Lane / Cross Road. The extent of these reviews and improvements will be dependent upon the layout of the development and decisions on the most appropriate access points for a development of potentially 1688 homes. A new access onto Holyhead Road may be appropriate.
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	N
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable?	N. The site would not be able to deliver necessary improvements to Patshull Road or Newhouse Lane north of the site frontages for both vehicular and sustainable modes of transport to access Albrighton.
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service):	18
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	Reduction in developable area available due to presence of ponds.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	An Environmental. Network corridor (a ditch) runs through part of site. There are a number of ponds on and in close proximity to the site. Ponds (priority habitat) should be retained, buffered and connectivity increased, which will reduce the developable area available. If GCNs are present in any of the ponds, buffers of at least 50m are likely to be required. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (in trees), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. The hedgerows will need to be appropriately buffered. PROWs cross the site.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Very large site which would be likely to impact on the settings of Grade II listed Lea Hall (NHLE ref. 1274036) and Boningale Conservation Area. Site would substantially reduce spatial separation between Albrighton and Boningale. Numerous metal detectorist finds from the site which suggests it may have archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of LBs and CA; archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	hedgerows and mature trees and groups of trees around and within site
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	due to size of site - full EIA and landscape character assessment and VIA. At a smaller scale - Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	use 20% canopy cover policy to plant trees and woodland within site. large area of land so affords opportunity to integrate existing trees and groups of trees within a matrix of open space and natural habitat. Expand woodland adjacent southern boundary.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	, in the second
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Roads around boundary of the site creating noise.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Good
Appraisal:	
Strategic Considerations:	There is safeguarded land to the east of Albrighton intended to make provision for settlement development needs. This site is in Green Belt to the south of the settlement. As the sites availability is currently unknown, the site is not considered suitable for allocation. However it may have potential for future safeguarding. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. A small proportion of the site is located within 30 and/or 100 year surface water flooding. 10% of the site is within the 1,000 year surface flood zone. The site is separated from the built form of the settlement and projects into the countryside. Development could impact on settings of Grade II listed Lea Hall and Boningale Conservation Area. Site would substantially reduce spatial separation between Albrighton and Boningale. The site may have archaeological potential. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	- rage IVO

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? Recommendation	No Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning If proposed for Allocation, Potential	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The sites availability is currently unknown. Development could impact on settings of Grade II listed Lea Hall and Boningale Conservation Area. Site would substantially reduce spatial separation between Albrighton and Boningale. The site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm. The site is poorly related to the built form of the settlement.
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	P37a
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	Yes
Agricultural Land Quality:	163
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	0%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	0%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	0%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	0%
Historic Flood Map: 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
(from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a
Landscape Considerations:	high level of harm on the Green Belt.
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	Madiiii
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	Holyhead Road Cross Road Green 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?	Assuming access onto Cross Road with extension of speed limit and provision of footway along site frontage. Access onto Green Lane should not be allowed unless improvements to Green Lane north of the site can be delivered.
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):	13
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	None

Other Constraints:	The hedgerows will need to be appropriately buffered.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Poor spatial relationship with existing settlement form. No known archaeological interest but site is of a large size, so may have some archaeological potential
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	hedgerows and mature trees within and around site
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Road noise to the boundaries of the site. Commercial operation to the east creating possible noise, dusts, odour.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Poor
Appraisal: Strategic Considerations:	There is safeguarded land to the east of Albrighton intended to make provision for settlement development needs. This site is in Green Belt to the south of the settlement. As the sites availability is currently unknown, the site is not considered suitable for allocation. However it may have potential for future safeguarding. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. The site is separated from the built form of the settlement and projects into the countryside. The site may have archaeological potential. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site performs poorly in Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.

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? Recommendation	No Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The sites availability is currently unknown. The site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm. The site is poorly related to the built form of the settlement.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity: If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Reference: P37b Cond Authority Reference Area? No Mineral Safeguarding Area? M	Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Miller and September 1, 2 and for 3 Approximated Land Guellity. Percentage of late in Fined Zene 3: Percentage of the site in the 100 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 100 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 100 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 100 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the Int. Percentage of the Int. Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the Int. Percentage of the I		P37b
Miller and September 1, 2 and for 3 Approximated Land Guellity. Percentage of late in Fined Zene 3: Percentage of the site in the 100 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 100 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 100 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 100 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the Int. Percentage of the Int. Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year aufgree (Fined Int.) Percentage of the Int. Percentage of the I	Coal Authority Reference Area?	No.
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Approximate Land Octobriles Recreating of six in Flood Date 2: Percentage of six in Flood Date 3:		
Agrocultural land Guolity: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the site in the 30 year survive flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site in the 30 year survive flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site in the 30 year survive flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site in the 1000 year survive flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site in the 1000 year survive flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site in the 1000 year survive flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site in the 100 year survive flood Mag. Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site within 20m of a flood Zone 3: Percentage of Zone Zone 3: Percentage of Zone Zone 3: Percentage of Zone 3		110
Percentage of six in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of six six in the 30 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the six interflered on the EA Associated Associated Proceedings of the six interflered on the EA Associated Flood Risk Zone: Percentage of the six interflered on the EA Associated Risk Zone: Percentage of the six interflered on the EA Associated Risk Zone: Percentage of the six interflered on the EA Associated Risk Zone: Percentage of the six interflered on the EA Associated Risk Zone: The Green Belt Risk Zone: The Green Belt Associated Risk Zone: The Green Belt		Yes
Precentage of six in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the six in the 3D year author 6 pool xix is bein 3D year a	, ,	ov.
Percentage of the in Flood Zoon E: Percentage of the in the 30 year surface flood risk zone. Percentage of the in the 100 year surface flood risk zone. Percentage of the set with 2000 year surface flood risk zone. Percentage of the set with 2000 year surface flood risk zone. Percentage of the set with 2000 year surface flood risk zone. Percentage of the set with 2000 of on habstoric flood dept. Percentage of the set with 2000 of on habstoric flood dept. Percentage of the set with 2000 of on habstoric flood dept. Percentage of the set within 20m of on habstoric flood devent. Percentage of the set within 20m of on habstoric flood devent. Percentage of the set within 20m of on habstoric flood event. Percentage of the set within 20m of on habstoric flood event. Percentage of the set within 20m of o All or part of the sets within 20m of o All or part of the sets within 20m of o All or part of the sets within 20m of o Protection 20me. The Green Belf Konsiderations: (Form the 68 Assessment/Review) The Green Belf Konsiderations: (Form the 10KS) The Green Belf Konsiderations: (Form the 10KS) The Green Belf Konsiderations: (Form the 10KS) Medium (Form the 10KS) Weldium (Form the 10KS) Weldium		
Percention of the site in the 30 years without from the VSS water found in the VSS water for the VSS w	3 3	
surface (Pool risk zone: Proceedings of this test in the 100 year surface (Pool risk zone: Proceedings of this test the 11-100 year surface (Pool risk zone: Proceedings of this site within 20m of an Natron's (Pool Wish): Proceedings of this site within 20m of an Natron's (Pool Wish): Proceedings of this site within 20m of an Natron's (Pool Wish): Proceedings of this site within 20m of an Natron's (Pool Wish): Proceedings of this site within 20m of an Natron's (Pool Wish): Proceedings of this site within 20m of an Natron's (Pool Wish): Proceedings of this site within 20m of a deballist of the site within 20m of a deballist o	Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
surface placed risk zone: When the Set in the 1000 year surface; placed risk zone: Onk When the Set in the 1,000 year surface; placed risk zone: Onk When the Set in the 1,000 year surface; placed risk zone: Onk Whetercentage of the site within 20m of an Abstroit, placed wisk zone: Onk Abstroit, placed wisk zone: Protection 2 benefit of an or of the site within 3 bource Protection 2 benefit of an or of the site within 3 bource Protection 2 benefit of an or of the site within 3 bource Protection 2 benefit of an or of the site within 3 bource Protection 2 benefit of an or of the site within 3 bource Protection 2 benefit of an or of the site within 3 bource Protection 2 benefit of an or of the site within 3 bource Protection 2 benefit of an or of the site within 3 bource Protection 2 benefit of an or of the site within 4 bource and a stroit of a site within 4 bource and a stroit of a site within 4 bource and a stroit of a site within 4 bource and a stroit of a site within 4 bource and a stroit of a site within 4 bource and a stroit of a site within 4 bource and a stroit of a site within 5 bource and a stroit of a site within 5 bource and a stroit of a site within 5 bource and a stroit of a site within 5 bource and a stroit of a site within 5 bource and a stroit of a site within 5 bource and a stroit of a site within 5 bource and a stroit of a site within 5 bource and a stroit of a site within 5 bource and a stroit of a site withi	Percentage of the site in the 30 year	0%
surface (Pod risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface (Pod risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an National Road Report National Road Road Report National Road Road Road Report National Road Road Road Road Road Road Road Road	surface flood risk zone:	078
surface (Pod risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface (Pod risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an National Road Report National Road Road Report National Road Road Road Report National Road Road Road Road Road Road Road Road	Percentage of the site in the 100 year	
Percentage of the six in the L,000 years yarfore flood risk steene: Percentage of the six dentified on the EA Hetaton Flood Made: Percentage of the six dentified on the EA Hetaton Flood Made: Percentage of the six dentified on the EA Hetaton Flood Made: Percentage of the six dentified on the EA Hetaton Flood Made: Percentage of the six within 20 mg of a death of the Considerations: Percentage of the six within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment Undertaken for Strophine indicates that this site isocrated within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2, moderately against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Strophine indicates that this site isocrated within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2, moderately against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Strophine indicates that this site isocrated within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Strophine indicates that this site isocrated within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Strophine indicates that this site isocrated within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Strophine indicates that this site isocrated within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt assessment for the Strongly against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt parcel which performs weakly		0%
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of a historic flood Wag: Percentage of the site within 20m of a historic flood went: Protection of the site within 20m of a detailed wire network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt **Considerations: Original flood read of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. He Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Medium M		
Percentage of the size identified on the EA Hattors Fload Map: Percentage of the size within 20 mg of m Statistics fload event: Percentage of the size within 20 mg of m Statistics fload event: Percentage of the size within 20 mg of m Statistics fload event events: All or part of the size within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this size is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this size is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this size is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this size is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this size is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this size is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this size is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this size is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; and strongly against purpose 3; and stron		0%
Historic Flood Mag: Precentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Protection of the site within 20m of a decided rive network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Individual Considerations: If from the LVSS Medium		
Percentage of the site within 20m of an initiation flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detabled river entrovors: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Idendiscape Considerations: (from the CBS) Idendiscape Considerations: (from the CVS) Identification to the Side Side Side Side Side Side Side Sid		0%
historic flood event: Perecrotage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Identification of the CVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Livisting Highway Statoble for Troffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Will provide the Costs of Note Statisting Highway at Access Point is Not Statisting Highway Comments - Fixisting Highway Comments - Could the Development Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Cocur Without Off-Stee Works Achievoble? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes works Achievoble? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place.		
Percentage of the site within 20m of a decited inver network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt * Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Identicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Identicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Identicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Identicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Identicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Identicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Identicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Identicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Identicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. Identicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. Identicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. Identicates that the release of the parcel containing		0%
detailed rive network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Landscape Considerations: (from the USS) Landscape Considerations: (from the USS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - Liveting Highway Suitable for Troffic Associated with the Development of the Access Point's Not Suitable Con It Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Fixisting Highway at Access Point's Not Suitable Con It Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Cocur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? V. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? V. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Linds of the Cock of Public Trips of the Public Trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Linds of the Cock of Public Trips of the Public Trip	,	
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zane: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2, moderately against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Indicator Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium (from		0%
Frotection Zone: Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) In Green Belt Assessment/Review) The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2, moderately against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. In Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. In Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Medium Medium Medium Y Brighway Comments - If No Direct Access, to yellow of the Containing This site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Medium Y Brighway Comments - If No Direct Access, to On Direct Access, to On One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Wild Direct Access Point? We Comments - Fasisting Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development of the Access Point? We will be a statisfactory on the Green Lane of the South of the Sout	detailed river network:	070
Frotection Zone: Green Belt* Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) In Green Belt Assessment/Review) The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2, moderately against purpose 3, and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. In Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. In Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Medium Medium Medium Y Brighway Comments - If No Direct Access, to yellow of the Containing This site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Medium Y Brighway Comments - If No Direct Access, to On Direct Access, to On One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Wild Direct Access Point? We Comments - Fasisting Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development of the Access Point? We will be a statisfactory on the Green Lane of the South of the Sout	All or part of the site within a Source	
The Green Belt Assessment/Review) The Green Belt Assessment/Review) The Green Belt Assessment/Review) The Green Belt Assessment/Review) The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Identifying the LVSS Medium Medi		Yes
performs weekly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Indiscape Considerations:		
performs weekly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Indiscape Considerations:		
performs weekly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Indiscape Considerations:		
The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Individual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Individual Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium		The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which
Indiscape Considerations: Indiscape Considerations: Infrom the LVSS) Install Impact Considerations: Infrom the LVSS Install Impact Considerations: Infrom the LVSS Install Impact Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Infly Impact Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Install Impact Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Install Impact Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Install Impact Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Install Impact Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Install Impact Comments - Could Impact	Green Belt* Considerations:	performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4.
Indiscape Considerations: Indiscape Considerations: Infrom the LVSS) Install Impact Considerations: Infrom the LVSS Install Impact Considerations: Infrom the LVSS Install Impact Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Infly Impact Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Install Impact Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Install Impact Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Install Impact Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Install Impact Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Install Impact Comments - Could Impact	(from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a
Londscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Medi	, ,	
Iffrom the LVSS Medium		ingricite of harmon are discar beta
Iffrom the LVSS Medium		
Iffrom the LVSS Medium		
Wedium W	Landscape Considerations:	
Wisual Impact Considerations: [from the LVSS] Medium	(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway New	,	
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highway Saccessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments		Medium
Highway Network? 17 No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highway Saccessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments		
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And Holyhead Road Bowling Green Lane Green Lane How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments None	-	Y
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments	_ ·	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes site Works Achievable? 12 Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments		
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments	•	Holyhead Road Bowling Green Lane Green Lane
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service):	How?	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service):	Highway Commonts Existing Highway	
Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Whighway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments		V
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Works? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service):		Y .
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. None	Development at the Access Point?	
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. None		
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. None		
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. None	Highway Comments If Evisting Highway	
Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. Bowling Green Lane unless improvements on these roads, to the north of the site, can be delivered. N Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments		But onto Holyhead Road only. An estate road access for potentially 382 homes would not be satisfactory onto Green Lane or
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments		
Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments None	Reasonably be Made So?	,
Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments None		
Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments None		
Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments	Highway Comments - Could the	
Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments		N I
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments		
Site Works Achievable? place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments		
Site Works Achievable? place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments		
Site Works Achievable? place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments		
Site Works Achievable? place. Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments	Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	Y. If vehicular trips into Albrighton can be controlled such that no routing via Bowling Green Lane and Green Lane takes
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments None		
24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments None		r · · ·
24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments None		
24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments None		
24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments None	Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments None		
Transport Service): Ecology Comments None		12
Ecology Comments None		
None		
Significant Constraints:	Ecology Comments	None
	Significant Constraints:	IVOIIC

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (in trees), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. The hedgerows will need to be appropriately buffered. A PROW crosses the site.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Poor spatial relationship with existing settlement form. No known archaeological interest but site is of a large size, so may have some archaeological potential
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	scattered trees and gappy hedgerows around site
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Commercial in the north, east and south creating possible noise, dust odour including possible kennel in the south and a depot in the east.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. Significant separation distances may be necessary.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Poor
Appraisal:	1001
Strategic Considerations:	There is safeguarded land to the east of Albrighton intended to make provision for settlement development needs. This site is in Green Belt to the south of the settlement. As the sites availability is currently unknown, the site is not considered suitable for allocation. However it may have potential for future safeguarding. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. The site is separated from the built form of the settlement and projects into the countryside. The site may have archaeological potential. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site performs poorly in Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Page 112

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? Recommendation	No Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The sites availability is currently unknown. The site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm. The site is poorly related to the built form of the settlement.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3 Site Reference: P38 Coal Authority Reference Area? No Mineral Safeguarding Area? No Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	
Coal Authority Reference Area? Mineral Safeguarding Area? No Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: No Yes	
Mineral Safeguarding Area? Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: No Yes	l.
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Yes	
Agricultural Land Quality:	
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: 0%	-
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: 100%	
Percentage of the site in the 30 year	
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	
Historic Flood Map:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	
historic flood event:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	
detailed river network: 0%	
All or part of the site within a Source	
Protection Zone:	
The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parce performs weakly against purpose 2, purpose 3 and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would low-moderate level of harm on the Green Belt.	
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
, "	
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	
16	
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed.	
Significant Constraints: The treeline/hedgerow should be appropriately buffered, reducing the developable area available.	

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	If priority habitat, the 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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	mature hedgerow inside southern site boundary
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	Sewage works to the north east of the site creating odour on occasion. Bringing residential properties closer to this site may cause concerns to the sewage treatment works operator.
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Fair
Strategic Considerations:	There is safeguarded land to the east of Albrighton intended to make provision for settlement development needs. This site is in Green Belt to the north of the settlement. As the sites availability is currently unknown, the site is not considered suitable for allocation. However it may have potential for future safeguarding. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2, purpose 3 and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a low-moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. The site contains a mature hedgerow and may contain priority habitats.
	A small proportion of the site is located within the 30 year and 100 year surface flood zones. 22% of the site is within the 1,000 year surface flood zone. The site is located in the gap between Albrighton and Cosford. The site is adjacent to a sewage treatment works which will require due consideration. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land. Page 115

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 intrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation? Recommendation	No Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The sites availability is currently unknown. Whilst the site is considered to be located within a Green Belt parcel, where the release would result in low-moderate harm it is also located in the gap between Cosford and Albrighton.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	P39
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
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	100%
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	
	1%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	1%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	0%
Historic Flood Map:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	0%
historic flood event:	The state of the s
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	0%
detailed river network:	
All or part of the site within a Source	Yes
Protection Zone:	10
	The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which
Cusan Balt* Canaidayatiana	·
Green Belt* Considerations:	performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4.
(from the GB Assessment/Review)	The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a
	high level of harm on the Green Belt.
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Υ
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments If Evisting High	
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway	
at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	
Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	N
Works?	
	Y. Subject to a check on the capacity of Rectory Road and consideration of a shared highway network with ALB015 & P002
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	which would allow westbound traffic to access the Newport Rd via ALB015. This group of sites could accommodate 957
Site Works Achievable?	homes. This is particularly important as there is a pinch point on Rectory Rd south of the site frontage where third party land
S.C. WORKS ACINE PUDIC:	would be required for any improvements.
	would be required for any improvements.
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	13
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	13
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	
Significant Constraints:	None
Significant constraints.	

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The northern boundary forms an Environmental. Network corridor. Requires survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	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 Environmental. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Medium sized site with a number of metal detectorist finds reported from it suggesting some archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	trees to northern and east site boundaries
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	plant large, long-lived trees within site open space as part of a quality landscape scheme.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Rail to the north creating noise.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings plus boundary treatment as necessary to the rail.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Poor
Strategic Considerations:	There is safeguarded land to the east of Albrighton intended to make provision for settlement development needs. This site is in Green Belt to the north of the settlement. As the sites availability is currently unknown, the site is not considered suitable for allocation. However it may have potential for future safeguarding. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs weakly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that the release of the parcel containing this site would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt. The site is separated from the built form of the settlement by other land. It is also some distance from the majority of the services and facilities in the settlement. Capacity of local highway network (Rectory Lane) and access would require assessment and potentially improvement to accommodate development. This may require land outside the promoted site to be achieved, including land in third party ownership. The site is bounded by the railway line to the north and is also located within the gap between Albrighton and Cosford. The noise associated with these features will require due consideration. The site also contains some mature trees; environmental networks; and may contain priority habitats, these factors will require due consideration. The site is located within a source protection zone, Environment Agency Guidance will need to be considered. The site performs poorly in Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.

Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Capacity of local highway network (Rectory Lane) and access would require assessment and potentially improvement to accommodate development. This may require land outside the promoted site to be achieved, including land in third party ownership. 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? Recommendation	No Retain as Green Belt
Reasoning If proposed for Allocation, Potential	Safeguarded land available to meet settlement development requirements along with infill and exception site opportunities. The sites availability is currently unknown. The site is considered to be located within a sensitive Green Belt parcel, the release of which would have high harm. Furthermore the site is separated from the built form of the settlement by other land located within the same sensitive Green Belt parcel. Beyond this other land is a Local Nature Reserve, between the site and the built form of the settlement. The site is located in the gap between Cosford and Albrighton.
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Purpose 1 (checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas - only applies to parcels adjacent to large built up areas);

Purpose 2 (merging of neighbouring towns);

Purpose 3 (safeguarding countryside from encroachment); Purpose 4 (preserving setting/character of historic towns); and