Appendix E Broseley 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.

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

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: BEH001 | Site Ref: BEH002 | Site Ref: BEH003X | Site Ref: BEH006 | Site Ref: BEH007 | Site Ref: BEH008 | Site Ref: BRO004 | Site Ref: BRO006X | Site Ref: BRO007 | Site Ref: BRO010 | Site Ref: BRO011 | Site Ref: BRO012 |
|----------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that | apply): | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site National Nature Reserve | Yes = double minus | 0 | <u> </u> | 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 | 140 - 2010 30010 (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply) | · | · · | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 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 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | _ | - | 0 | _ | - |
| | 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Yes = minus score (-) | | - | Ů | <u> </u> | - | | | - | _ | | J | - |
| 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 |
| | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | • | - | 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 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | . , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all | that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | + | + | 1 | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | + |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | 1 | - |
| 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) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| _ | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Yes = minus score (-) | | | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Yes = minus score (-) | _ | _ | _ | | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 40 | 07 1 11 1 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1 | Yes = minus score (-) | _ | _ | _ | • | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | • | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4.4 | 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 |
| 40 | | Yes = minus score (-) | 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 | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | a Registered Battlefield | 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 | 140 - 2610 30016 (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 5 of one or more (record all that apply | r | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 300m of a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for | Double minus score () | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | residential | 2002.0 Hillias 30016 (/ | ļ | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | | | ļ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| | landscape sensitivity for residential | 2010 30010 (0) | | " | , , | | " | " | " | " | " | | | <u> </u> |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | site is inside the development boundary | | ļ | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Overall Score | | 1 | 1 | 1 | -3 | 1 | -1 | -2 | -1 | -2 | -6 | -4 |
| | Range is 1 to -8 Good is 1 to -2 Fair is -3 to -5 Poor is -6 to -8 Ove | rall Sustainability Conclusion | Good | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Poor | Fair |
| - | | | · | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: BRO014 | Site Ref: BRO015 | Site Ref: BRO020 | Site Ref: BRO021 | Site Ref: BRO022 | Site Ref: BRO024 | Site Ref: BRO026 | Site Ref: BRO027 | Site Ref: BRO028X | Site Ref: BRO029 | Site Ref: BRO030 | Site Ref: BRO031 |
|----------|---|--|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that Special Area of Conservation | арріу): | 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) |): | Ť | | | | , | | | , | | | | |
| | 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 | V () | 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 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| | 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | T D (1 D 1 (1 1 D 1 1 1 D 1 1 D 1 1 D 1 | Yes = minus score (-) | ^ | | | _ | | _ | _ | _ | _ | • | _ | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | No = zero score (0) | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | | 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 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all t | that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | - 1-1- 4/ | - | + | + | + | + | - | + | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | + | - | + | - | - | + | + | + | - | - |
| 1 | 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 (-) | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | versatile) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 |
| | | No = zero score (0) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an | Yes = plus score (+) | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| | area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | No = zero score (0) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | No = zero score (0) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that ap | opiy): | | | | | | | | | | | _ | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 40 | a Scheduled Monument | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | a Registered Battlefield | 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 |
| 1 | a Conservation Area | | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | |
| - | a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply) |): - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| 144 | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | Von = ====== () | 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 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 300m of a Listed Building | | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for | Double minus score () | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | <u> </u> |
| | residential | | | | | | | - | | | - | | | 4 |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| 1 | | (/ | | | | | | | | | - | | | <u> </u> |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high | Zero score (0) | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| | landscape sensitivity for residential | (0) | | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | | | | <u> </u> |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or | Plus score (+) | | | + | | | 1 | | | + | | | |
| | site is inside the development boundary | ` ' | | | | | ļ | ļ | | | | | | <u> </u> |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> |
| | | Overall Score | -7 | -2 | -2 | -2 | -1 | -3 | -3 | -1 | -3 | -4 | -4 | -3 |
| | Range is 1 to -8 Good is 1 to -2 Fair is -3 to -5 Poor is -6 to -8 Over | rall Sustainability Conclusion | Poor | Good | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Secondary of party minimizer case or more of the discharging (need at file apply) 1 | Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: BRO032 | Site Ref: BRO033 | Site Ref: BRO034 | Site Ref: BRO035X | Site Ref: BRO036 | Site Ref: BRO037 | Site Ref: BRO038 | Site Ref: BRO039 | Site Ref: BRO040 | Site Ref: BRO041 | Site Ref: BRO042 | Site Ref: BRO043 |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Section of Section Continues (Section Continues) | | | арріу): | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Package Pack | | | | | | - | , , | | | | Ŭ | | | | 0 |
| Source S | | | Ves = double minus | Ŭ | | | Ů | · | , , | | Ů | | Ŭ | Ŭ | 0 |
| An amount described An amount of the content of the description An amount of the content of the content of the description An amount of the content of the conte | 1 | | | | | - | | | | | Ŭ | | | Ŭ | 0 |
| Model Section Company and Company and Company and Red Section Co | | | ` ' | | | - | · | | | | Ŭ | | | Ŭ | 0 |
| Cost Nation Reserver | | | 710 2070 00070 (0) | | | - | | | | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Size househop within bother some "of one or more (proceed all flast apply)." 2 | | | | | Ů | | · | | | | n | | 0 | Ŭ | 0 |
| Second and Commentation Second Assessment | | | • | - | , | - U | Ů | _ | <u> </u> | _ | | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| Transford February Selection Selection Transford February Selection Transford February Selection Selection Transford February Selection Transford February Selection Selection Transford February Selection Sele | | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 Solitine of a places section determinal Ves. 5 minus section () 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fig. of a file of States (Should presented Fig. | | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Color of Ancest incontains Color of State Color of | 2 | | * / | 0 | _ | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Single of a britishing file and a state in the state of the state in the state of | | | No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | - | 0 | - |
| Children of Laboral National Principles of Services (1985) 1.5 | | | | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| See Continued professional continued or all grounds professional and analyses of the Continued professional and analyses of the Continued professional analyses of the Conti | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| See Continued professional continued or all grounds professional and analyses of the Continued professional and analyses of the Continued professional analyses of the Conti | _ | | Yes = minus score (-) | | | _ | • | | | | • | • | • | • | _ |
| Size contents one or more (or part of the following! (record all that apply): | 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| Continues plagogeneries Yes - Inflant score () 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| See Temporary with 1980 of a control period space An analysis An a | | | -1)- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Primetry green spaces | 4 | | Yes = minus score (-) | | | - | · | | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| Ricesable mature green space instrumentary related and process green g | | | () | | | - | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site boundary within 480m of one or more of the following (record all that apply): | | | (-) | | | | 0 | | | • | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Privary School | | | that apply): | <u> </u> | 1 | - | _ | _ | 1 | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ |
| Consideration of mobile library stop) Vest = plus score (-) Vest = plus | | | | - | - | _ | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Leaves can control profit plants story Yee = plus score (*) Ye | | | | | | | + | | - | - | | | | - | - |
| Second content | | | | | | | - | | - | | | | | | - |
| Chiefen S playspard (| 5 | | Yes = plus score (+) | - | - | _ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Custoor sports facility | | | | - | - | _ | + | - | + | - | + | - | - | - | - |
| Accessible entailur green space | | | , | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Accessable natural green space (natural/areni-enhaltral green space) | | • | | | - | _ | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + |
| Site boundary within 480m² of a public transport node with a regular No minus score (-) N | | | | - | + | + | _ | _ | - | _ | + | _ | _ | _ | _ |
| Service offered during peak travel times 5: | | | Ves = nlus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sile windy or party on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most Ne 2 eron score () | 6 | | | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| No = zero score (0) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ## All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) Yes = minus source () | 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most | Yes = minus score (-) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| No - zero score (i) | | versatile) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No Part of the steel's within in local cones 2 of 3 No Earon score (0) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | , , , | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 Site wholly/parity within an Air Quality Management Area No. 2000 | 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 Site winds/papity within art and ucularly management nees No = zero score (0) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ste is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 Site would displace an existing waste management operation Yes = minus score (c) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 Site would displace an existing waste management operation Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 11 | | | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 |
| 12 Site would asplace an existing waste management operation No = zero score (0) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | | | | | | | | | _ | _ | _ | | |
| Site wholiy/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| A World Heritage Site or its buffer zone 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | , , , | | | | | _ | _ | | - | | _ | _ | | - |
| a Scheduled Monument Registered Park or Garden a Registered Park or Garden a Listed Building Site boundary within buffer zone ³ of one or more (record all that apply): 30m of a Worstered Battlefield Yes = double minus score (-) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | оріу): | | | | _ | | | | | | | | |
| 13 a Registered Battlefield Score (-) No = zero score (0) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | | | | - | , , | | | | | | Ŭ | Ŭ | 0 |
| 13 A Registered Battlefield Score (-) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | Yes = double minus | | | | · | | | | , , | | | ŭ | 0 |
| A Registered Park or Garden No = zero score (0) | 13 | | | | | | · | | | | Ŭ | | | Ŭ | 0 |
| Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply): O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | ` , | | | _ | · | | | | Ŭ | | | Ŭ | 0 |
| Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply): 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone 0 | | | | | | | · | | | | Ŭ | | | | 0 |
| 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | U | U | 0 | 0 | 0 | U | U | 0 | U | 0 |
| 14 300m of a Scheduled Monument Yes = minus score (-) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | : | | | | _ | | | | | | | | |
| 14 300m of a Registered Battlefield 300m of a Registered Park or Garden No = zero score (-) No = zer | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | , , | - | 0 |
| 300m of a Registered Park or Garden No = zero score (0) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | V | | | | | | | | ŭ | | | Ŭ | 0 |
| 300m of a Conservation Area 300m of a Listed Building Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential Minus score (-) Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -5 -7 -4 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 | 14 | | | | | _ | · | | | | ı | | | | 0 |
| 300m of a Listed Building Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential Minus score (-) Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly/partly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary Plus score (+) Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -5 -7 -4 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 | | | NO = zero score (U) | | | _ | U | | | U | Ŭ | | , , | U | 0 |
| Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential Minus score (-) Minus score (-) Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -5 -7 -4 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 0 -3 | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | ŭ | U | | - | 0 |
| residential Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential Minus score (-) Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential or Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -5 -7 -4 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 0 -3 | | | | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential or Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O | | | Double minus score () | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -5 -7 -4 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 0 -3 | | residential | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -5 -7 -4 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 0 -3 | | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -5 -7 -4 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 0 -3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -5 -7 -4 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 0 -3 | 15 | | Zero score (0) | | | | n | 0 | 0 | 0 | n | n | n | | 0 |
| site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -5 -7 -4 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 0 -3 | | | 20,0 000,0 (0) | | | | | ļ | ļ , | | | | ļ | | ļ |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -5 -7 -4 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 0 -3 | | | Plus score (+) | | | + | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Score -5 -7 -4 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 0 -3 | | | ` ′ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Renge is 1 to 8 Good is 1 to 2 Fair is 3 to 5 Poor is 6 to 8 Overall Sustainability Conclusion Fair Poor Fair Good Good Good Good Good Good Good Goo | | | | | -7 | - | -1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 0 | | 0 |
| nango is no -o cook is no -a rout is no -a rout is -a to -a rout is -a ro | | Range is 1 to -8 Good is 1 to -2 Fair is -3 to -5 Poor is -6 to -8 Over | rall Sustainability Conclusion | Fair | Poor | Fair | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Good |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: JKD001 | Site Ref: JKD002 | Site Ref: JKD003 | Site Ref: JKD004 | Site Ref |
|----------|--|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that | apply): | | _ | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | National Nature Reserve | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| , | Site of Special Scientific Interest | score () | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Local Nature Reserve | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply) | A. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | <i>)-</i> | 0 | ^ | 0 | _ | 0 |
| | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | ` ′ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | 1 | | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | | U | U | U | U | U |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) | | _ | | _ | 0 |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (Single or group) within or on site boundary | No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | _ | 0 |
| | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app | oly): | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | <u> </u> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Outdoor sports facility | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | , , | () | | | <u> </u> | | |
| | Amenity green space | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all | that apply): | | | | | |
| | Primary School | - 1-1- 27 | _ | _ | _ | + | + |
| | GP surgery | 1 | - | - | - | - | <u> </u> |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | _ | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | Leisure centre | Yes = plus score (+) | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | 1 '' 1 | - | - | - | + | + |
| | | | | - | _ | + | + |
| | 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 (-) | + | + | + | + | - |
| | | 17 | | | | | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| , | versatile) | No = zero score (0) | U | " | " | " | " |
| | , | Yes = minus score (-) | | | | | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | () | | | | | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 7 iii or part of the one to warm rioda zones z or c | No = zero score (0) | Ů | Ů | | Ů | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | _ | | | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an | Yes = plus score (+) | | | | | |
| 11 | | . , | + | + | + | + | 0 |
| | area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | No = zero score (0) | | | | | |
| 10 | Cite would displace an existing wests management energtion | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | No = zero score (0) | U | U | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that a | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | ~~· <i>y /</i> · | | | 0 | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | | | 0 | | |
| | a Scheduled Monument | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | a Registered Battlefield | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | score () | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | No = zero score (0) | | | 0 | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone 5 of one or more (record all that apply, |): | | <u></u> | <u></u> | | <u> </u> |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | ` ′ | | | <u> </u> | | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 300m of a Listed Building |] | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for | | | | <u> </u> | Ť | Ť |
| | | Double minus score () | | | | | |
| | residential | , | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | |
| | one is whony/partly diasonied as high famuscape sensitivity for residential | Willias Score (-) | | | | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | Zero score (0) | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | landscape sensitivity for residential | ` ' | | | | | + |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or | Plus score (+) | | + | | | |
| | site is inside the development boundary | Fius score (+) | | * | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca | ategory is recorded | | | | | 1 |
| | The state of the s | | 0 | A | 2 | 7 | - |
| | | Overall Score | -8 | -4 | -3 | -7 | -8 |
| | Range is 1 to -8 Good is 1 to -2 Fair is -3 to -5 Poor is -6 to -8 Ove | rall Sustainability Conclusion | Poor | Fair | Fair | Poor | Poo |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|--|--|
| Site Reference: | BEH001 |
| Site Address: | Land adjacent to Benthall Villa Farm and Morris Corfield and Co Ltd, Benthall |
| Settlement: | Benthall near Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.19 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 36 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Part of an agricultural field located between Benthall Villa Farm and Morris Corfield and Co Ltd. To the north west of Benthall. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. However, there are residential dwellings to the east and south east of the site and the adjacent Morris Corfield and Co Ltd site (west) is a commercial enterprise. |
| Suitability Information: | No. C. Walde |
| (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 more closely associated with the built form of Benthall than Broseley. It lies to the west of Benthall, with the built form of Benthall between it and the built form of Bridgnorth. |
| Summary: 1, 2 and 3 Further information | 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: | BEH002 |
| Site Address: | Land south west of Benthall |
| Settlement: | Benthall near Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.59 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 108 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | An agricultural field separated from the built form of Benthall (to the north) by another agricultural field. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is a mix of agricultural and forestry/woodland. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) | |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informatio | 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. |
| Availabili | \mathbf{v}^{1} . |
| Availabili | y . |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitabili | The site is remote from the built form of the settlement being more closely associated with the built form of Benthall than Broseley. It is separated from the built form of Broseley 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: | BEH003X |
| Site Address: | Bethnall Grange |
| Settlement: | Benthall near Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.14 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 4 |
| Type of Site: | |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield | N/A |
| General Description: | A small brownfield site within Benthall. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural, residential and commercial. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informati | 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. |
| Availabi | ity¹: |
| Conclusion: Size ² | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not |
| Strategic Suitabi | ity ³ : As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|--|--|
| Site Reference: | BEH006 |
| Site Address: | Land to east of Longbourne House, Benthall |
| Settlement: | Benthall near Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.92 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 28 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | Approx. 35% |
| General Description: | Part of the site appears to be infrequently used in associated with the Morris Corfield and Co Lit works site on the opposite side of Benthall Lane. The remainder of the site consists of an area of scrubland and a grassed field. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the south is forestry/woodland. Character to the immediate west is forestry/woodland beyond which it is agricultural. Character to the north is a mix of agricultural and commercial. Character to the east is a mix of agricultural and residential. |
| Suitability Information: | No. C. Yorkii |
| (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 ³ : | The site is more closely associated with the built form of Benthall than Broseley. It lies to the west of Benthall, with the built form of Benthall between it and the built form of Bridgnorth. |
| Summary: 1, 2 and 3 Further information | 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: | BEH007 |
| Site Address: | South of Benthall Lane, Benthall |
| Settlement: | Benthall near Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 7.18 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 215 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A large irregularly shaped site located within to the south of Benthall comprising of a series of agricultural fields. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to north and north west is predominantly residential. Character to the west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the south is predominantly woodland/forest. Character to the east is a mix of agricultural, woodled areas and dwellings with I |
| Suitability Information: | Net College |
| (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. |
| Assailabilit | 1 |
| Availabilit | / : |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitabilit | The site is remote from the built form of the settlement being more closely associated with the built form of Benthall than Broseley. It is separated from the built form of Broseley 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: | BEH008 |
| Site Address: | Land off Lodge Lane, Benthall |
| Settlement: | Benthall near Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.29 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 39 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of the northern part of an agricultural field, located to the south of dwellings fronting Benthall Lane. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the south and east is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is a mix of woodland/forestry and agricultural. Character to the immediate north is residential, beyond which is agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: | Net Cuiteble |
| (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informatio | 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. |
| Availabil | _{5.} 1. |
| Availabili | Ly: |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitabili | The site is remote from the built form of the settlement being more closely associated ty ³ : with the built form of Benthall than Broseley. It is separated from the built form of Broseley 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: | BRO004 |
| Site Address: | Land between Rough Lane and Pound Lane, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 4.71 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 141 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site is single parcel as agricultural land currently used as rough grazing, some farm buildings in northern part of site. Scattered mature trees and remnant hedgerows throughout site. Strong boundaries to W with existing residential properties on Forester Rd and Blakeway Close; N with residential properties on Collins Close and Rough Lane; E clearly defined boundary of hedgerows and trees with agricultural field; S with Caughley Rd and further agricultural land. Slight upward slope from N to S. Site is outside but adjacent to development boundary. Land to N between Rough Lane and Coalport Rd pp refused (14/04018/OUT) and appeal dismissed Feb 2016. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural to S and E |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not currently suitable but ruture rotential |
| 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 Suitabilit | y 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: | BRO006X |
| Site Address: | Land east of Bridge Road |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.05 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield | N/A |
| General Description: | A densely wooded site to the west of Broseley |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural, scrubland and residential. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informat | 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. |
| Availab | lity¹: |
| Conclusion: Size | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not |
| Strategic Suitab | lity ³ : As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | BRO007 |
| Site Address: | Land to east of Dark Lane, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.21 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 36 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield | N/A |
| General Description: | Site lies to E of Dark Lane outside development boundary and to E and N of main settlement. Is agricultural land currently used for rough grazing or open land - has been farmed more intensively in past. Irregular shaped parcel with ill-defined boundaries comprised mature trees and overgrown hedgerows on all 4 sides. Not directly adjacent to development boundary - separated by Dark lane and residential property (3 Dark Lane). Slight downward slope from NW to SE. Access via track to Dark Lane - no clear direct access to Dark Lane. Site is opposite Dark Lane site with pp for 88 dwells (14/02911/FUL) works commenced. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural land - rough grazing. Boundary with single property (3 Dark Lane). |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not currently Suitable but I utule Fotential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informati | 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. |
| Availabi | ity ¹ : |
| Conclusion: Size ² | |
| Strategic Suitabi | ity 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: | BRO010 |
| Site Address: | Land off Cherrybrook Drive, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.08 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 32 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield | N/A |
| General Description: | Irregular shaped site adjacent to development boundary. Currently 'scrub' woodland and established trees as extension of tree cover on 'Stocking Mound'. Site lies to E of Cherry Brook Drive to N of existing industrial site off Cockshutt lane (site BRO002) to S of Broseley Cricket Club and existing wooded area known as 'Stocking Mound'. Boundaries are clearly defined with residential properties to W and industrial site to S and E; boundary with woodland to N not clearly defined. Road access only onto Cheery Brook Drive; pedestrian access only via existing network via Cherry Brook Drive. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential to W; Industrial to S and E woodland and cricket ground to N. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not Currently Sultable but I dtule Fotential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informati | 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. |
| Availabi | lity¹: |
| Conclusion: Size ² | |
| Strategic Suitabi | lity 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: | BRO011 |
| Site Address: | Land At Cobwell Road, Bridge Road, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.52 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 16 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Wedge shaped parcel of land outside development boundary but within conservation area. Currently scrub trees with some mature established trees. Bounded by residential development to W on opposite side Bridge Rd and Off Cobwell Rd to E; to N by residential and further woodland. Access either onto Bridge Rd or Cobwell road; pedestrian access via existing links on Bridge Rd, Cobwell Rd or Quarry rd. Site slopes S to N down Bridge Rd. Site has history of past mining and industrial use and is in Coal Authority High Risk area. And is in close proximity to Workhouse Coppice Local Wildlife Site. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential - estate development off Cobwell road and single plots on Bridge Rd. Woodland to N running down towards Ironbridge Gorge. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not currently suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| 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: | BRO012 |
| Site Address: | Land at Barratt's Hill, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.67 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 20 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Irregular shaped parcel on W edge of settlement outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently agricultural use for rough grazing and informal amenity land with mature trees and established hedgerows. Existing residential properties to N and E further agricultural land to S and W. Obvious boundaries with residential properties to N and E; boundaries with agricultural land less well defined by hedgerows and trees. Road access and frontage onto Barratt's Hill (B4375) pedestrian access via existing pavements on Barratts Hill. Within Conservation Area and in close proximity to Penns Meadow Local Wildlife site. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural land to W and S residential to E and N. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not currently suitable but ruture rotential |
| 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. |
| Availabilit | y¹: |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitabilit | y³: |
| 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: | BRO014 |
| Site Address: | Land off Spout Lane |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.35 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 10 |
| Type of Site: | |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield | N/A |
| General Description: | Small parcel on W edge of settlement. Currently no discernible use - scrub woodland vegetation with some mature trees on boundaries; no obvious agricultural use maybe some informal amenity use. Outside development boundary but separated by residential properties on Bridge rd. Within conservation area and in close proximity to Work House Meadows and The Mines Local Wildlife Sites and Benthall Edge Wood Ancient Woodland. Boundary to N with Spout Lane and to S and E with residential properties; not clearly defined to W. Road frontage and access onto Spout Lane only; pedestrian access via Spout Lane only no pavements. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential to E and S, unimproved scrubland to W and woodland of Work House Meadows wildlife site to N. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not currently saltable but rature rotential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Informat | 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. |
| | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed |
| Availab | to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Conclusion: Size | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not |
| Strategic Suitab | lity 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: | BRO015 |
| Site Address: | Land south of Avenue Road |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.83 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 55 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site comprises part ELR017 - employment land allocation in Broseley. Application 16/02438/REF on adjoining land for mixed residential and employment refused 06/10/2015 then granted on appeal 31/08/2016. Site lies to SE of settlement outside development boundary. Currently in agricultural use with existing farmhouse and farm buildings (The Dunge Farm) on site. Boundaries to W with Avenue Rd; to S, N and E with agricultural land defined by hedgerows and trees and N (part) with properties on Pound lane. Road frontage and access onto Avenue Rd; pedestrian links via existing network on Avenue Rd. Overhead electricity and pylon present on site |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural to S and E residential to N and W. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not currently suitable but ruture rotential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Not 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. |
| | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed |
| Availabilit | to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitabilit | y 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: | BRO020 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Avenue Road, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.22 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings | s): 7 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfi | eld: Approx. 25% |
| General Description: | House and large garden site on E edge of settlement within development boundary and conservation area. Several mature trees on site. Boundaries clearly defined with neighbouring residential properties. Road access and frontage onto track off Avenue Rd; pedestrian access via existing links on Avenue Rd. |
| Surrounding Character: | Established residential area - some large detached dwellings with large gardens, some estate development (Bright Grove). Opposite BRO0015 and site with pp for mixed use development. |
| Suitability Information: | Compatible Statis |
| (from SLAA) | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Inform | 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. |
| Availa | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Conclusion: Siz | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the other promoted site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| Strategic Suita | ability 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: | BRO021 |
| Site Address: | Land at Coneybury Farm, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 6.94 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 208 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently in agricultural use for grazing/fodder crops. Site is bounded by residential estate development to S; Ironbridge Rd and residential properties to W; Coneybury Farm complex and farmland to N and E. Boundaries are clearly defined with residential properties and area mixture of trees hedgerows and fences with neighbouring agricultural land. Some of the boundaries contain mature trees and stretches of established hedgerow. Site has no road frontage or access to current highway network, site is accessed via Coneybury Farm. Promoter claims access from Coalport Close development which appears to be in other private ownership as driveway to 2 properties, nevertheless this access would appear unsuitable for size of site proposed. Pedestrian and cycle access could be via Coalport Close or Ironbridge Rd to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Mixture of agricultural and residential |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site |
| Availability | 1. |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability | ³ : The site appears to be landlocked, without a road frontage. |
| 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: | BRO022 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Broseley Lodge, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 10.76 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwelling | s): 323 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfi | eld: N/A |
| General Description: | Wooded area to the south west of Broseley. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential to the north. Wooded to the south. Agricultural to the east and west. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Not Available |
| Achievability/Viability Inform | 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. |
| Availa | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Conclusion: Siz | ze ² : |
| Strategic Suita | Approximately 1/3 of the site contains a Local Wildlife Site. The southern element of the site is densely wooded and forms part of a wider woodland corridor. These elements of the site are therefore unsuitable for development. This remainder of the site in isolation has no road frontage or potential point of access. However, there are other promoted sites which could provide this site a road frontage (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | BRO024 |
| Site Address: | Land off Barratts Hill, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.19 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings) | : 6 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfiel | d: Approx. 25% |
| General Description: | Irregular shaped parcel on Western edge of settlement outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently informal amenity land with mature trees. Existing residential properties to N and E further agricultural land to S and W. Obvious boundaries with residential properties to N and E; boundaries with agricultural land less well defined. Road access and frontage onto Barratt's Hill (B4375) pedestrian access via existing pavements on Barratts Hill. Within Conservation Area and in close proximity to Penns Meadow Local Wildlife site. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural land to W and S residential to E and N. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not currently suitable but rutare roterital |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informa | 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. |
| Availab | pility¹: |
| Conclusion: Size | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.5ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Strategic Suital | pility 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: | BRO026 |
| Site Address: | Land off Cockshutt Lane, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.31 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 69 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Site on N edge of settlement to N of existing employment area (former WH Dixon site). Site is bounded by B2 use to E; agricultural to N and E; woodland (the 'Stocking Mound') to W and S. Boundaries clear and defensible to W with neighbouring employment use; to N, W and S not readily discernible. Site is currently mixed use with some former industrial land used for storage and/or informal waste management; to N is trees/scrub whilst N portion of site is managed grazing with residential property and garden. Site is outside development boundary and conservation area. No road frontage but site could be accessed through BRO002 or via lane to New House. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agriculture to N, industry to E and ; woodland to W on reclaimed ground. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not currently suitable but ruture rotential |
| 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. |
| | As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed |
| Availability ¹ : | 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: | BRO027 |
| Site Address: | Land at Firey Fields, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.26 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings) | 38 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfiel | d: N/A |
| General Description: | Part superseded by BRO037. Site on outside development boundary on SW edge of settlement currently in agricultural use - rough grazing. Residential estate to E off Bridgnorth Rd; agricultural uses to N, W, and S. Site is adjacent to Fiery Fields Local Wildlife site. Boundaries well defined with neighbouring residential property to E and agriculture and woodland to S and W; not well defined to N. No road frontage, access would have to be via other adjacent sites footpath links through residential estate and via PROW to W and S. Site relatively flat slight upward slope from W to E . High voltage overhead cables across N extremity of site and 33kv wooden posts and cables across centre of site running NW to Se. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential estate to E off Bridgnorth Rd; agricultural uses to N, W, and S |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informa | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site |
| Availab | ility¹: |
| Conclusion: Size | |
| Strategic Suitab | This site in isolation has no road frontage or potential point of access. However, there are other promoted sites which could provide this site a road frontage (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | BRO028X |
| Site Address: | The Pheasant Inn, 56 Church Street |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.10 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield | : N/A |
| General Description: | The Pheasant Inn and its curtilage. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential, commercial and medical. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) | NOT Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informat | 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. |
| Availab | lity¹: |
| Conclusion: Size | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the other promoted site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| Strategic Suitab | lity ³ : As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | BRO029 |
| Site Address: | Land south west of Mill Lane, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.27 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 68 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield | : N/A |
| General Description: | Site lies on W edge of Broseley outside but directly adjacent in part to the development boundary and conservation area. The site consists of part of an agricultural field and an area with a high concentration of trees. There is a farm building located on the site. |
| Surrounding Character: | Site to the east recently gained planning permission for 6 dwellings. To the east and north the character is predominantly residential. To the south and west the character is predominantly agricultural and countryside character. |
| Suitability Information: | N . C |
| (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informati | 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. |
| Augilahi | 1:1 |
| Availabi | iity: |
| Conclusion: Size ² | |
| Strategic Suitabi | |
| 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: | BRO030 |
| Site Address: | Land adjacent Woodlands Close, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.66 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 20 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary currently in agricultural use as rough grazing/pasture. Site is bounded by estate development of Woodlands Close to W; Woodlands farmhouse and farmland to S; further farmland to N and E. Boundaries clearly defined with residential properties on Woodlands Close and to S with Woodlands farmhouse but boundaries to E and N appear arbitrary across farmland. Site has no road frontage as such but can be accessed via existing 'hammerhead' on Woodlands Close; pedestrian and cycle access via same access to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agriculture and residential |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but I utule Fotential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informati | 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. |
| Availabi | lity¹: |
| Conclusion: Size ² | |
| Strategic Suitabi | lity 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: | BRO031 |
| Site Address: | West of Bridge Road, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.82 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 84 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield | l: N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to Broseley development boundary. Site currently in use for rough grazing and informal recreation. N portion of site previously subject to mineral extraction and now 'unknown filled ground'. Site is bounded by Bridge Rd and Hilltop private property to W; by Floyer Lane and the Bentlands estate development and further agricultural land to E; to N by individual properties; to S by Benthall Lane and individual properties. Boundaries are clearly defined on the ground by a mixture of trees, hedgerows and fencing. Site has road frontage to Bridge Rd, Floyer Lane and Benthall Lane vehicle access currently off Bridge Rd. Cycle and pedestrian access via same routes. |
| Surrounding Character: | Mixed agricultural and residential |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Retential |
| (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informati | 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. |
| Availabi | ility¹: |
| Conclusion: Size | 2: |
| Strategic Suitabi | ility 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: | BRO032 |
| Site Address: | West of Floyer Lane, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.36 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 71 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside and removed from Broseley development boundary. Site currently in use for rough grazing and informal recreation. Site is bounded mostly by agricultural land with small boundary with Bentlands estate development on S corner; and top E with Hilltop Cottage and Floyer Hall. Boundaries clearly defined by established hedgerows and mature trees. In N corner of site remains of redundant farm buildings or possible mining related buildings. Site does not have a road frontage or apparent vehicle access - Floyer Lane is unsuitable for vehicles past Floyer Hall. |
| Surrounding Character: | Mostly agricultural with some residential development |
| Suitability Information: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) | Not suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informat | 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. |
| Availab | lity¹: |
| Conclusion: Size | |
| Strategic Suitab | In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). Furthermore, this site in isolation has no road frontage or potential point of access. However, there are other promoted sites which could provide this site a road frontage (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | BRO033 |
| Site Address: | Adj. The Bayliffe's House off Spot Lane, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.28 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellin | ngs): 8 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brown | field: N/A |
| General Description: | Small parcel on W edge of settlement. Currently no discernible use - scrub woodland vegetation with some mature trees on boundaries; no obvious agricultural use maybe some informal amenity use. Outside development boundary but separated by residential properties on Spout Lane and Bridge rd. Within conservation area and in close proximity to Work House Meadows and The Mines Local Wildlife Sites and Benthall Edge Wood Ancient Woodland. Boundary to S with Spout Lane residential properties; boundary to W ancient woodland and LWS; to E with access drive to Bayliffe's House. Road frontage and access onto Spout Lane only; pedestrian access via Spout Lane only no pavements. Boundaries clearly defined to E, by LWS and woodland, to S by residential properties to W by access drive but to north appears arbitrary. |
| Surrounding Character: | Woodland and residential |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Infor | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site |
| Ava | ilability ¹ : |
| Conclusion: | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the other promoted site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| Strategic Su | itability 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: | BRO034 |
| Site Address: | Adj. Brook Cottage, 4 Bridge Rd, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.21 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings) | : 6 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfiel | d: N/A |
| General Description: | Small greenfield site within development boundary. Currently in use as garden land (so; ancillary residential) of Brook Cottage. Site includes numerous mature trees internally and forming boundaries with adjoining properties. Site is surrounded by residential properties and has road frontage and vehicle access to Bridge St to W. |
| Surrounding Character: | Gardens and residential properties |
| Suitability Information: | Currently Suitable |
| (from SLAA) | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informa | 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. |
| Availab | pility¹: |
| Conclusion: Size | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not |
| Strategic Suitak | pility 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: | BRO035X |
| Site Address: | Land off Chapel Lane, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.11 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | <5 |
| Type of Site: | |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield. | N/A |
| General Description: | A small site containing woodland and scrubland. |
| Surrounding Character: | Woodland, scrubland, agricultural land and rural dwellings. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) | THOU Suituble |
| 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. |
| Availabil | ity ¹ : |
| Conclusion: Size ² | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.5ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). |
| Strategic Suitabil | ity ³ : As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | BRO036 |
| Site Address: | Land off Avenue Road, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 6.82 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 205 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Site currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops and grazing. Site has road frontage and vehicle access off Avenue Rd on NW boundary of site and to Pound La/Caughley Rd on SW boundary. Pedestrian and cycle access via Avenue Rd or Spout Lane to existing established network. Boundaries of site are clearly defined by mature trees and established hedgerows except on SE boundary which appears to be arbitrary line across existing fields. Site is crossed by 5 set of overhead power lines with at least 2 sets of 400Kv lines. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural and residential. Site is bounded to W and S by agricultural land. To the N planning permission has been granted for a mixed residential and employment development. To the E is an existing residential estate development. |
| Suitability Information: | Net Comments Contable but Fotoms But and I |
| (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informatio | 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. |
| الناما والمراد | . 1. |
| Availabili | ty: |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitabili | ty 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: | BRO037 |
| Site Address: | Land west of Bridgnorth Road, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.02 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 31 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield | N/A |
| General Description: | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on SW edge of town. Current use of site is not clear maybe used for rough grazing and informal recreation. Site is bounded by residential development to N, S and E and further agricultural land to W. Site boundaries are clearly defined by adjacent residential properties to N, S, and E; however W boundary appears to be arbitrary line across field with no discernible definition. Site is bisected by 2 sets overhead power lines 1 of 400kv and also contains many established trees. Site does not have road frontage and vehicle access is via track on N boundary to Bridgnorth Rd pedestrian and cycle access via same. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential and agricultural |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not currently suitable but i uture i otential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Informati | 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. |
| Availabi | ity¹: |
| Conclusion: Size ² | |
| Strategic Suitabi | ity 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: | | BRO038 |
| Site Address: | | Adjacent to the Cemetery, Broseley |
| Settlement: | | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | | 0.33 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellin | igs): | 10 |
| Type of Site: | | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brown | field: | N/A |
| General Description: | fi li d | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently in agricultural use for rough grazing. Site is bounded by cemetery to N and W and by residential land and ronbridge Rd to E and Mines Meadow estate development to S. Boundaries are clearly defined on ground by established trees and hedgerows. Road frontage and vehicle access to ronbridge Rd; pedestrian and cycle access via same. |
| Surrounding Character: | F | Residential, agricultural and cemetery |
| Suitability Information: (from SLAA) | | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Infor | mation: S | 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. |
| Ava | ilability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: | Size ² : c | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the other promoted site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). |
| Strategic Su | itability 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: | BRO039 |
| Site Address: | Land east of Dark Lane, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 6.23 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 187 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large greenfield site to E of Dark Lane opposite Broseley Primary School outside current development boundary. Currently 3 agricultural fields currently used for hay/sileage crops. Access directly onto Dark lane. Site subdivided by existing established managed hedgerow. Boundaries defined to N and S by existing hedgerows, no clear boundaries at all to E; to W boundary with Dark Lane. Site slopes downward from S to N. Site bounded by Dark Lane, Primary School, and residential estate development to W; by residential properties to N and agricultural land to S and E. |
| Surrounding Character: | Residential and agricultural |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not currently suitable but ruture rotential |
| 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 | |
| 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: | BRO040 |
| Site Address: | Coalport Road |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.47 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 44 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Green field outside but adjacent to the development boundary on the eastern edge of the settlement, to the south of Coalport road. Currently used for grazing/pasture. The site falls roughly down to the east, with the eastern boundary delineated by a post and rail fence; N, S and W boundaries comprised 'gappy' hedgerows and scattered mature trees. Site is bounded by further farmland to S and W and residential estate development to E and N. Site has road frontage and onto Coalport road but current vehicle access appears to be from Rough Lane (single track, unpaved access track) to S. Cycle and pedestrian access via Coalport Rd and Rough Lane to existing established network. |
| Surrounding Character: | Agricultural and residential |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not currently Sultable but I uture Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| 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: | BRO041 |
| Site Address: | Land at Coalport Road, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.09 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwelling | s): 93 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfi | eld: N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of two agricultural fields located between Coalport Road and residential properties on Rough Lane. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural with a row of dwellings to the north and south of the site. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Inform | 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. |
| Availa | ability ¹ : |
| Conclusion: Si | ze²: |
| Strategic Suita | 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: | BRO042 | |
| Site Address: | Land west of Monewood House, Broseley | |
| Settlement: | Broseley | |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.68 | |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 20 | |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield | |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield | N/A | |
| General Description: | The site consists of an area of scrubland/woodland located to the east of Broseley. Site boundaries are defined by Ironbridge Road to the west, woodland to the north and south and is relatively undefined to the east. | |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the west and north is a mix of woodland and large rural dwellings on large plots. Character to the south is predominantly woodland. Character to the east is a mix of woodland and scrubland. | |
| Suitability Information: | N/A | |
| (from SLAA) | N/A | |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available | |
| Achievability/Viability Informati | 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. | |
| Availabi | lity¹: | |
| Conclusion: Size | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the other promoted site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint). | |
| Strategic Suitabi | lity ³ : The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. | |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | BRO043 |
| Site Address: | Land at Coalport Road, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.47 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 44 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield. | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of two agricultural fields located between Coalport Road and residential properties on Rough Lane. Site boundaries are defined by Coalport Road to the north, residential curtilages to the south and west and a brook to the east. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the west is predominantly residential. Character to the north and south is a residential beyond which it is agricultural. Character to the east is predominantly agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: | NI/A |
| (from SLAA) | N/A |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availabil | ity¹: |
| Conclusion: Size ² | |
| Strategic Suitabil | ity ³ : The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | | |
|---|--|--|
| Site Reference: | JKD001 | |
| Site Address: | Land to north of The Woodlands, Jackfield, Broseley | |
| Settlement: | Jackfield, Broseley | |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.64 | |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 19 | |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield | |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A | |
| General Description: | Densely wooded site located to the north east of Jackfield near to the Jackfield Tile Museum. | |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is a mix of residential, to north west and south and agricultural/woodland and a leisure to the west. | |
| 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 ³ | The site is densely wooded, and these trees are subject to a group TPO protection. | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. | |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | Site Assessment - Stage 2b | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Site Reference: | JKD002 | | |
| Site Address: | Land off Calcutts Road, Jackfield, Broseley | | |
| Settlement: | Jackfield, Broseley | | |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.39 | | |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 12 | | |
| Type of Site: | Mixed | | |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | Approx. 15% | | |
| General Description: | The site consists of a single residential dwelling and its extensive curtilage. | | |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is a mix of commercial and residential. | | |
| Suitability Information: | Currently Suitable | | |
| (from SLAA) | Currently 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 | 1: | | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.5ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint). | | |
| 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: | JKD003 |
| Site Address: | The Rock Metal Works, Calcutts Road, Jackfield, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Jackfield, Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.43 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 43 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | Approx. 75% |
| General Description: | The site consists of the Rock Metal Works Site (a protected employment site) and its associated landscaping. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is a mix of commercial, residential, agricultural and woodland. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Petential |
| (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| 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: | JKD004 |
| Site Address: | Land off Ironbridge Road, Jackfield, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Jackfield, Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.69 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 51 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of an agricultural field located to the east of Broseley. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the west is predominantly residential. Character to the north is a mix of residential and agricultural. Character to the east and south is predominantly agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) | Not Currently Suitable but I ditale Fotential |
| 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 : | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions |
| Summary: | reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | JKD004VAR |
| Site Address: | Land off Ironbridge Road, Jackfield, Broseley |
| Settlement: | Jackfield, Broseley |
| Site Size (Ha): | 5.10 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 153 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of an agricultural/wooded areas located to the east of Broseley. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the west is predominantly residential. Character to the north is a mix of residential and agricultural. Character to the east and south is predominantly agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: | N/A |
| (from SLAA) | N/A |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability | ¹ : |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability | ³ : 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.

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | BRO004 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| 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 | 0% |
| 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 | 5% |
| 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 | |
| detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | |
| Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Medium-Low and Medium-High |
| 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 | Υ |
| Development at the Access Point? | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at | Via Barrah I.a. / Callina Cl |
| Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | Via Rough La / Collins Cl |
| Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | Y |
| Works? | · |
| | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | Assumes vehicular access would not be via Pound La. |
| Site Works Achievable? | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, | 21 |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport | 21 |
| Service): | |
| Foods we Come | |
| Ecology Comments | None |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| | |
| | |
| | EcIA required. Bat potential in mature trees and also notable species recorded nearby that are likely to forage |
| Ecology Comments | over this area given 'wide' character. Retain mature trees and hedges in landscaping as part of corridor. Northern |
| Other Constraints: | portion is within Environmental Network and also identified as potentially priority habitat which would require |
| | survey between May and end of August. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows on boundaries. Retain mature |
| Management of Constraints: | trees in field. Enhance and restore Env. Network to north and west in accordance with CS17 Environmental |
| management of constraints. | Networks and MD12. Extend the network to the south along the east boundary |
| | |
| | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Enhancement of the network to the east and south. Also greenspace provision should be accessible to existing housing to the west who currently don't have much Accessible Natural Greenspace. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|--|--|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | HER indicates that eastern side of site previously formed part of the Dunge Colliery and associated coal workings (HER PRN 07285). N part of the site also formed part of the Broseley Tileries (HER PRN 04631) and is crossed by the former course of an early tramway (HER PRN 07287). Site therefore holds archaeological interest. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation). |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: Tree Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | hedgerows and trees to site boundary and trees and scrub internal to northern end 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: | Contaminated land possible due to past mining operations and historic railway line crossing the site. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Remediation possible. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability | Cond |
| Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| Reasoning | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | BRO007 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | N. |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | No |
| 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: | 6% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | |
| historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | |
| detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | |
| Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Medium-High |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | |
| Highway Network? | Υ |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Using current field access / Bridleway |
| How? | osing current field decess / Bridle way |
| 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. But suitable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto Dark |
| Reasonably be Made So? | Lane without acquiring third party land. |
| Highway Comments - Could the | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | Υ |
| Works? | T T |
| VVOINS: | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | |
| Site Works Achievable? | |
| Highways Associability Bating (Out Of 24) | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, | |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport | 23 |
| Service): | |
| Service). | |
| Ecology Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | None |
| - grigicant constraints | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | EcIA required. Grassland has been identified as potentially of UK Priority status. Haycop Local Wildlife Site is |
| Other Constraints: | adjacent and has significant fungi species and also Dingy Skipper (UK Priority Species). Both of which could also |
| | be found on this site. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows on boundaries. Enhance and |
| Ecology Comments | restore Env. Network surrounding most of site in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| Management of Constraints: | Extend the network to the south along the east boundary |
| | |
| | |

| Approximatives: Approximative woodshare age as part of the past adjacent to the Wildlife Size. See also standard list of opportunities: | Ecology Comments | Suggest green/brown roofs as habitat for priority butterflies and moths and to reduce surface water run-off. Avoid topsoil on open space where possible. Use 'green hay' technique for seeding any grassland - ideally using |
|--|---|---|
| Revitage Comments Site located adjacent to former Clench Acre Mine (HER PRN 32987), so has some archaeological potential. | | with most enhancements being to the north east adjacent to the Wildlife Site. See also standard list of |
| Other Constraints: Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: Heritage Comments Opportunities: Price Comments Other Constraints: Stee Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Management of Constraints: Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Management of Constraints: Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Possible land contamination. Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Officer Constraints: Remediation available. Federal Supporting Studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant sender areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant sender areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant sender areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Pl | | |
| Management of Constraints: Heritage Comments Opportunities: Tree Comments Significant Constraints: Site surrounded by trees and continuous with wider network of woodland. Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method 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 Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Mindfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their reco | | Site located adjacent to former Clench Acre Mine (HER PRN 32987), so has some archaeological potential. |
| Opportunities: Tree Comments Significant Constraints: site surrounded by trees and continuous with wider network of woodland. Tree Comments Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Tree Comments Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Public Protection Comments None Significant Constraints: Possible land contamination. Public Protection Comments Possible land contamination. Other Constraints: Remediation available. Public Protection Comments Remediation available. Management of Constraints: Good Vapprotaction Comments Good Opportunities: Good Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Good Appraisat: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Known Infrastructure Opportunities: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. Sec comments from relevant service areas. Po | | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + ?evaluation). |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: Standard BSS837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Management of Constraints: Standard BSS837 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 Opportunities: Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: Strategic Considerations: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Known Infrastructure Opportunities: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Fotential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Resommendation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | | |
| Significant Constraints: Tree Comments Other 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: None Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Amanagement of Constraints: Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Remediation available. Strategic Considerations: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments form relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan process. Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan process. Potential for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | , , | |
| Site surrounded by frees and continuous with wider network of woodland. Tree Comments Management of Constraints: 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: Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Known Infrastructure Opportunities: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | | |
| Management of Constraints: Tree Comments Opportunities: Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: Public Protection Comments Offer Constraints: Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: Public Protection Comments Opportunities: Conclusion - Stage 28 Sustainability Appraisal: Strategic Considerations: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Reasoning A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | | site surrounded by trees and continuous with wider network of woodland. |
| Opportunities: Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: Public Protection Comments Opportunities: Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: Strategic Considerations: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | | |
| Significant Constraints: Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: Public Protection Comments Opportunities: Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: Strategic Considerations: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | | Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: Public Protection Comments Opportunities: Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: Strategic Considerations: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | | None |
| Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: Public Protection Comments Opportunities: Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: Strategic Considerations: Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Known Infrastructure Opportunities: Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | Public Protection Comments | Possible land contamination. |
| Management of Constraints: Public Protection Comments Opportunities: Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: Strategic Considerations: Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Resoning A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | Other Constraints: | |
| Opportunities: Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: Strategic Considerations: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Reasoning A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | | Remediation available. |
| Appraisal: Strategic Considerations: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan process. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan process. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan process. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | | |
| To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. | | Good |
| Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Reasoning A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Reasoning A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process |
| See comments from relevant service areas. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | · · | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Windfall? Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Reasoning A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | |
| Potential for Allocation? To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Recommendation To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | | |
| Reasoning Reasoning A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | | |
| Reasoning A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | | |
| Reasoning employment guidelines identified for the town. If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | Recommendation | |
| Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | Reasoning | |
| If proposed for Allocation | | |
| | | |
| Design Requirements: | | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|--|--|
| Site Reference: | BRO010 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | No |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | INO |
| 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 | 5% |
| surface flood risk zone: | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 19% |
| surface flood risk zone: | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 34% |
| 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 | No. |
| Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: | Very High |
| (from the LVSS) | very night |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | High |
| (from the LVSS) | 1 11511 |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | Υ |
| Highway Network? | · |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Via Cherrybrook Drive |
| How? | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | Υ |
| Development at the Access Point? | T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T |
| 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? | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, | |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport | 21 |
| Service): | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in |
| Significant Constraints: | open space provision. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | Much of site appears to be woodland, scrub or potential priority open habitat of some kind. Two ponds are |
| Other Constraints: | present nearby. Environmental Network covers much of site. |
| | processing, and a second mass, or site. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | provision. Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Very likely to have reptiles on site in the open areas |
| management of constraints. | near paths. Buffers would be needed to the pond and the woodland areas leaving very little for development |
| | |
| | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements in woodland and open habitat. Avoid topsoil on open space where possible. Suggest green/brown roofs and reduce surface water run-off. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|--|--|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Western side of site contains former mine workings (HER PRN 32861) and therefore hold archaeological interest |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation). |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | site is covered in trees and scrub and connects to adjoining and wider woodland network. |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments | Possible land contamination. Possible noise etc from factories to the south. |
| Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Remediation available. Potential to mitigate noise by location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| Reasoning | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | BRO011 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | No |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | NO |
| 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 | |
| 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 | N. |
| Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: | Vorulliah |
| (from the LVSS) | Very High |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | High |
| (from the LVSS) | High |
| 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 | V |
| 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 | Given scale of development |
| Reasonably be Made So? | diven scale of development |
| 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 | 14 |
| Service): | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision. |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected species mitigation and enhancement. A pond is present to the west which would require survey for newts. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision. Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Buffers would be needed to the pond and the woodland areas leaving very little for development |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements in woodland and open habitat. Avoid topsoil on open space where possible. Suggest green/brown roofs and reduce surface water run-off. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|--|--|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site located within Broseley Conservation Area and setting of the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site. Former coal workings (HER PRN 31083) and a tramway (HER PRN 31082) present on site, so hold archaeological interest. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation; impact on character and appearance of CA and settings of WHS). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA. |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | site is covered in coppice and other woodland, part of which is subject to a TPO. It connects to the woodland of Ironbridge Gorge |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | |
| Public Protection Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: Public Protection Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | Possible land contamination. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Remediation available but mining shaft on site which could cause stability issues etc (outside my remit but worth noting). |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| Reasoning | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | BRO012 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | No |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | No |
| 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: | 10% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 12% |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1270 |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 17% |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1770 |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% |
| Historic Flood Map: | 070 |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% |
| historic flood event: | 070 |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 0% |
| detailed river network: | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | No |
| Protection Zone: | |
| Landscape Considerations: | Medium |
| (from the LVSS) | |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | Medium-Low |
| (from the LVSS) | |
| 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 | N |
| Development at the Access Point? | '' |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at | |
| Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | Y. Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of development |
| Reasonably be Made So? | The same of the sa |
| Highway Comments - Could the | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | Υ |
| Works? | |
| Wielenson Comments And Environment Off | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | |
| Site Works Achievable? | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, | 17 |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport | <u>*</u> / |
| Service): | |
| Foology Comments | |
| Ecology Comments | None |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | EcIA required. Most of site is within the Environmental Network. Bat potential in mature trees. Retain mature |
| Other Constraints: | trees and hedges in landscaping as part of corridor, any open space to be adjacent to and enhance Env. Network. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Notwork and retention of mature trace unlikely to |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision |
| management of constraints. | be fully possible in open space provision |
| | |
| | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Avoid topsoil on open space where possible. Use 'green hay' technique for seeding any grassland - ideally using hay from the nearby. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|--|---|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site located within Broseley Conservation Area and may fall within the settings of a number of the Grade II listed buildings in the vicinity. HER indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of post-medieval coal workings may be present across much the site (HER PRNs 04565 &0728), so site may hold archaeological interest. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment; impact on character and appearance of CA and settings of LBs). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA. |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | numerous trees spread across most of 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: | |
| Public Protection Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments | Noise from road to the north of the site. |
| Other Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Potential to mitigate noise by location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability | Fair |
| Appraisal: | |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| Reasoning | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|--|---|
| Site Reference: | BRO024 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | No |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | NO |
| 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 | 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 | |
| historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | |
| detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | |
| Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: | N do alicens |
| (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | Medium-Low |
| (from the LVSS) | Wiedlufff-Low |
| 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 | N |
| 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 | Y. Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of development |
| Reasonably be Made So? | 1. Suitability of access will freed to be checked by probably on given small scale of development |
| 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 | 18 |
| Service): | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | None |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | EclA required. All the site is within the Environmental Network. Bat potential in mature trees. Retain mature trees |
| Other Constraints: | and hedges in landscaping as part of corrido. The grassland shows promise so would require survey between May |
| | and end of August. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to |
| Management of Constraints: | be fully possible in open space provision |
| management of constraints. | be fully possible in open space provision |
| | |
| | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Avoid topsoil on open space where possible. Use 'green hay' technique for seeding any grassland - ideally using hay from the nearby. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|--|---|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site located within Broseley Conservation Area and may fall within the settings of a number of the Grade II listed buildings in the vicinity. HER indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of post-medieval coal workings may be present across much the site (HER PRNs 04565 &0728), so site may hold archaeological interest. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment; impact on character and appearance of CA and settings of LBs). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA. |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: Tree Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | relatively small site with numerous trees |
| 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 | None |
| Significant Constraints: Public Protection Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | None |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | None required. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability | F |
| Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| Reasoning | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Cool Authority Reference Aero? Wes Wholly or Putily Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Approximation (and opating): Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site in the LO Opear author, Plood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the LO Opear author, Plood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the LO Opear author, Plood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the LO Opear author, Plood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the LO Opear author, Plood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the LO Opear author, Plood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an hastoric, Pood event. Percentage of the site within 20m of an hastoric, Pood event. Percentage of the site within 20m of an hastoric, Pood event. Percentage of the site within 20m of an hastoric, Pood event. Percentage of the site within 20m of an hastoric, Pood event. No Percentage of the site within 20m of an hastoric, Pood event. No Percentage of the site within 20m of an hastoric, Pood event. No Percentage of the site within 20m of an hastoric, Pood event. No Percentage of the site within 20m of an hastoric, Pood event. No Percentage of the site within 20m of an hastoric, Pood event. No Percentage of the site within 20m of an hastoric, Pood event. No Percentage of the site within 20m of an hastoric, Pood event. No Percentage of the site within 20m of an event and hastoric, Pood event. No Percentage of the site within 20m of an event and hastoric, Pood event. No Percentage of the site within 20m of an event and hastoric, Pood event. No Percentage of the site within 20m of an event and hastoric, Pood event. No Pood event. No Pood event. No Pood event. No | Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|--|---|---|
| Moneral Significant (and Carlott): Wholey or Portificate 1, 2 and for 3 Agricultural Land Gaulity: Percentage of six en Pload Zone 3: Percentage of the six en Inte 30 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 30 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 30 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 30 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 30 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 30 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 100 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 100 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inter 1000 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inter 1000 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six entire 1000 year suffice fload year suffice fload six entire 1000 year suffice fload year s | Site Reference: | BRO027 |
| Moneral Significant (and Carlott): Wholey or Portificate 1, 2 and for 3 Agricultural Land Gaulity: Percentage of six en Pload Zone 3: Percentage of the six en Inte 30 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 30 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 30 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 30 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 30 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 30 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 100 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inte 100 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inter 1000 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six en Inter 1000 year suffice fload six six en: Percentage of the six entire 1000 year suffice fload year suffice fload six entire 1000 year suffice fload year s | Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Agricultural Land Quality: 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 surface flood risk some Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk some Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk some Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk some Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk some Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk some Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk some Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk some Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk some Percentage of the site within 20m of an Instance flood within 20m of an Instance flood well. Percentage of the site within 20m of an Instance flood well. All or port of the risk within a Source Protection 20m: All or port of the risk within a Source Protection 20m: Macultural flood flood resident from the USS of the Source Protection 20m: Macultural flood flood resident from the USS of the William of the 100 year of the risk within a Source Protection 20m: Macultural flood flood resident from the USS of the William th | Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Agricultural Lond Clustry. Peterchaiga of site in Flood Zone 2: Peterchaiga of the site in the 30 year Juntifice Flood Asia one: DVK Juntifice Flood Asia one: Peterchaige of the site in the 100 year Juntifice Flood Asia one: Peterchaige of the site in the 100 year Juntifice Flood Asia one: Peterchaige of the site in the 1000 year Juntifice Flood Asia one: Peterchaige of the site in the 1000 year Juntifice Flood Asia one: Peterchaige of the site within 2000 year Juntifice Flood Asia one: Peterchaige of the site within 2000 year Juntifice Flood Asia one: Peterchaige of the site within 2000 year Juntifice Flood Asia one: Peterchaige of the site within 2000 year Juntifice Flood Asia one: Ju | Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | N- |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 years surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 30 years surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood should be six surface flood six flood of dedetaled river network: All or part of the site within 3 Source Protection Zone: Percentage of the site within 5 Source Protection Zone: Indistance Considerations: Indicate Considera | Agricultural Land Quality: | No |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 years surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 30 years surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood six ks nee: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood should be six surface flood six flood of dedetaled river network: All or part of the site within 3 Source Protection Zone: Percentage of the site within 5 Source Protection Zone: Indistance Considerations: Indicate Considera | Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood and is: 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 Road Map: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Road Map: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Road Map: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Road Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic Road Map: Percentage of the site within 5 Source Profection Zone: All or part of the site within 5 Source No Profection Zone: All or part of the site within 5 Source No Profection Zone: No Medium Item Individual Considerations: Indiginate Considerations: | | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood its kane: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood its kane: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood its kane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood its kane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood its kane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood its kane: 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 an historic flood event: 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 an historic flood event: 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 an historic flood event: 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 an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage Considerations: Medium Medium Medium Medium-Law Highway Comments - Within 20m of Access to Highway Comments - Stating Highway Station (Access Flood Hi | | 100% |
| surface (flood risk sone: Percentage of the stin in the 1,000 year surface (flood risk sone: Percentage of the stin in the 1,000 year surface (flood risk sone: Percentage of the stin in the 1,000 year surface (flood risk sone: Percentage of the stin within 20m of an historic (flood seems: Percentage of the stin within 20m of an historic (flood seems: Percentage of the stin within 20m of a detailed river entwork. All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river entwork. All or part of the site within 3 Source Protection Zone: Individual Considerations: (from the USS) | | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood in site on the 1,000 year surface flood in site of the site within 20m of an historic Flood Magn. Percentage of the site within 20m of an on historic Flood weart: Percentage of the site within 20m of an on other surface of the site within 20m of an on of the site within 20m of a detailed vier network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed vier network: All or part of the site within 20m of a other surface flood year of the site of the site of the surface flood year. No on on other surface flood year of the surface flood year of the surface flood year. No default of the flood year of the surface flood year of the surface flood year of the surface flood year. No default of the flood year of the surface flood year of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year. No default of the flood year of the flood year. No default of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year. No default of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year. No default of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year. No default of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year. No default of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year. No default of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year of the flood year. No default of the flood year of the flo | | 0% |
| Surface (Bood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface (Bood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an Percentage of the site within 20m of an O% Shistoric Flood Mag: Percentage of the site within 20m of an O% Shistoric Flood Shight (Shight Shight Shig | | 204 |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood its knone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood when: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an detailed international to the site within 20m of an detailed international to the site within 20m of a detailed international to the site within 20m of a detailed international to the site within 20m of a detailed international to the site within a Source Protection Zone: No Redium (Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVS5) Medium (Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVS5) Medium-Low Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - Il No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And hour? Highway Comments - Il No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And hour and the Access Point? Highway Comments - Il Switing Highway of Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Mode So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, 6P Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, 6P Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Fecology Comments Other Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. | | 2% |
| surface (Pood risk zone: 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 decided river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a decided river network | | |
| Percentage of the site winthin 20m af on historic Flood went: Percentage of the site within 20m af on historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m af on historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m af on detailed tiven network: All or part of the site within 30m af on detailed tiven network: All or part of the site within 30m af on detailed tiven network: All or part of the site within 30m af on detailed tiven network: No Condidation 20m: Indiana (Considerations: If the delium (Considerations: If the deli | | 4% |
| Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a decided river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indiscope Considerations: (From the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (From the LVSS) Inghway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Inghway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Assumed via Bridgnorth Road. How? Assumed via Bridgnorth Road. How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Subtable for Telfa Rassociated with the Development of the Access Point? Highway Comments - Glut the Development of the Access Point? Highway Comments - Glut the Development Cocur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Could the Development Cocur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Could the Development Cocur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for Survey. | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an institute 20m of a detailed vier network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed vier network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: No Indiascape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium (Wissual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium-Low Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Con One Reasonably Be Achieved? And Assumed via Bridgnorth Road. How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Troffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If No Stutible, Can It Highway Comments - Could the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Could the Development of Cour Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, 69 Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | 0% |
| historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detoiled river network: All or part of the site within Source Protection Zone: Industry Considerations: (from the LVSS) (From t | · | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: (from the LVSS) Medium Medium-Low Medium-Low Medium-Low Medium-Low Mighway Comments - Direct Access to highway Network? Mighway Network? Mighway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And Hallway Medium-Low Mighway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Poevelopment at the Access Point? Mighway Comments - T Busting Highway at Access Point? Mighway Comments - T Busting Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Mighway Comments - Could the Poevelopment Occur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Mighway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Mighway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Mighway Comments - Publish Rating (Out 07 24) (Bosed on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. | | 0% |
| detailed river networks All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indiscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) (f | | |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indianscape Considerations: If most the LVSS) Medium (Wissul Impact Considerations: If most the LVSS) Medium-Low 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 of the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Con It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Potential grassland interest: Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | detailed river network: | 0% |
| Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) (From the LVSC) (Fr | | |
| Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Medium-Low Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access, to Highway Comments - Fixed Direct Access, to Highway Comments - Fixed Direct Access, to Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Fixed Highway at Access Point is Nat 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments Service): Ecology Comments Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Protection Zone: | No |
| Medium M | | |
| Wedium-Low Medium-Low Med | | Medium |
| Ifform the LVSS Y Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And how? Assumed via Bridgnorth Road. Assumed via Bridgnorth Road. Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Triffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point Not Suitable, Con It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Y W W W W W W W W W | | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Troffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Kaisting Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Mode So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Saccessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | Medium-Low |
| Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Con One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Con it Reasonably be Made 5:0? Highway Comments - General Highway ot Access Point is Not Suitable, Con it Reasonably be Made 5:0? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Saccessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achleved? 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? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out 0f 24) (Based an Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wiidlife Site would need survey for | | Υ |
| 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 ot 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? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary Shool, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| 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? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | Assumed via Bridgnorth Road |
| 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? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Saccessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | Assumed via Bridgitor at Noda. |
| 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? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Development of 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site 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): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | · |
| 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? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | · | |
| 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 Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| 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 Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | , | |
| 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): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | • | V |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | , | r |
| Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | VVOIRS! | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Site Works Achievable? | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Highways Accessibility Patina (Out Of 24) | |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | 22 |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Sc. vicej. | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Ecology Comments | |
| Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | None |
| Other Constraints: nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | gy | |
| Other Constraints: nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Other Constraints: nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Other Constraints: nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Other Constraints: Could support bats. Could support bats. | Ecology Comments | |
| Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Other Constraints: | |
| | | could support bats. |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Management of Constraints: potential as a breeding site for Great Crested Newts. | Ecology Comments | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | Management of Constraints: | potential as a breeding site for Great Crested Newts. |
| | | |
| | | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Ensure hedgehog friendly development that includes gaps in fence gravel boards, etc. Plan areas of open space that compliment the priority habitats to the west and south. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|---|---|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | HER indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of early post-medieval coal workings (bell pits) are present across the site (HER PRN 04565), so site hold archaeological interest. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation). |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: Tree Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | site bordered by hedgerows and trees and connects to large block of woodland to the south |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Development stand-off to woodland to the south |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to connect to and extend woodland cover to the south. |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | none |
| Public Protection Comments | Describle resident by the restant for a consist for a section |
| Other Constraints: | Possible mine shaft on site noted for your information. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability | Good |
| Appraisal: | |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation Reasoning | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| Capacity: If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |
| Design requirements. | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | BRO029 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | N- |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | No |
| 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 | 00/ |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 0% |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 0% |
| surface flood risk zone: | 070 |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% |
| Historic Flood Map: | 070 |
| 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 | No |
| Protection Zone: | |
| Landscape Considerations: | Medium |
| (from the LVSS) | |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | Medium-Low |
| (from the LVSS) | |
| 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 | N |
| Development at the Access Point? | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at | |
| Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | N. Chapel Lane is unsuitable for the additional traffic that is likely to be generated by the development which may |
| Reasonably be Made So? | potential involve 90 homes. |
| Highway Comments - Could the | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | N |
| Works? | |
| Highway Comments Are Enviseded Off | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | N. The Chapel Lane / B4375 junction would need to be improved and third party land would be needed. |
| Site VVOIKS ACHIEVUDIE! | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, | 19 |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport | |
| Service): | |
| Ecology Comments | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | None |
| organificant constraints. | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | EclA required. Surveys for habitats, GCN (in pond 80m to west), Dormice (known records in general area), |
| Other Constraints: | Badgers (known), Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants, reptiles Some Environmental Network crosses site and, |
| | with more survey, additional core / priority habitat or corridor could be identified. |
| | |
| | |
| | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. |
| Ecology Comments | Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to south and east in accordance with |
| Management of Constraints: | CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network |
| | unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision. |
| | a |
| | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements and access to greenspace for existing housing. Better assess corridor and core environmental network, retain this and enhance where possible. Use 'Green Hay Strewing' technique as best practice for creation of grassland areas. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|--|--|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site located within and on the boundary of, and within the setting, of the Broseley Conservation Area. HER indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of early post-medieval coal workings (bell pits) are present across the site (HER PRN 04565), so site hold archaeological interest. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation; impact character and appearance on setting of CA). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA. |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: Tree Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | numerous trees around and within site, particularly areas in the central and northern parts of the 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: | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | None |
| Public Protection Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | None expected |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | None likely |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability | F-t- |
| Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Proceed by This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|--|---|
| Site Reference: | BRO030 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | No |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | |
| historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | |
| detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | |
| Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Very High |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | High |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | |
| Highway Network? | Υ |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Via Woodlands Close |
| 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 | N |
| Works? | |
| | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | N. it would be difficult to justify permitting development (20 homes in this case) that increased the traffic along |
| Site Works Achievable? | Woodlands Road and northern section of King Street. This route is very narrow and lacking any footway in places. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, | |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport | 12 |
| Service): | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | None |
| Significant Constraints: | NOTIE |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | Grassland may be of interest but low risk. Low risk of Reptiles on site. |
| Other Constraints: | Grassiana may be of interest bat low risk. Low risk of heptiles off site. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Simple ecological assessment all that is required (Extended Phase 1). |
| ividingement of constraints. | |
| | |
| | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: Heritage Comments | Opportunity to create linking corridor of woodland / hedgerow along eastern boundary to act as stepping stone for woods to north and south. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|--|--|
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Significant Constraints. | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site potentially within setting of Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of WHS) |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: Tree Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | single tree near entrance on south western side of site |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | |
| 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 | Potential contaminated land conditions required due to off site contamination migrating. |
| Other Constraints: | Totalital contaminated land contamination in grating. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Remediation possible. |
| Public Protection Comments | |
| Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability | Fair |
| Appraisal: | |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| Reasoning | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | BRO031 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | No |
| 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 | 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: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Medium-Low |
| 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 | N |
| Development at the Access Point? | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at | Y. This site would be able to deliver improvements to Floyer Lane. But suitable site access improvements onto |
| Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | Benthall Lane might be difficult to achieve. Access onto Bridge Road could be achieved. |
| Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | N |
| Works? | IN . |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | Y. If the site access is on Bridge Road then check would need to be made at the Benthall Lane / Bridge Road junction to ensure it was suitable to carry the additional traffic generated by the 84 home on this development. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, | 45 |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport | 15 |
| Service): | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | None |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| | Fold required Surveys for habitate CCN (in pand 20m to north). Badgars, Bata mosting hinds consults about |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | EcIA required. Surveys for habitats, GCN (in pond 20m to north), Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants, reptiles Majority of site is in the Environmental Network and, with additional survey, additional core / priority habitat or corridor could be identified. Tree Preservation Orders on several roadside trees on or adjacent to this site. Likely to be key foraging site for bats and birds of prey like Owls and Kestrel. Anthills in earlier Street View indicates good quality grassland. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision. |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Grassland areas appear to have been better at some stage. Opportunities to restore these as part of any open space allocation exists. Green Hay Strewing should be used if this ever happens. Suggest green/brown roofs and reduce surface water run-off. Enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Position between two Local Wildlife Sites of similar habitat suggests lots of opportunities to enhance area. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|--|---|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site located within Broseley Conservation Area. HER, LIDAR and historic OS maps indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of post-medieval coal workings are present across much the site (HER PRN 07284), so site hold archaeological interest. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation; impact on character and appearance of CA). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA. |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | limited tree and scrub cover 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 enhance tree cover in association with future development. |
| Public Protection Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Mine shafts and associated contamination likely. Potential noise from road. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Remediation where necessary for contaminated land. Regulatory Services are not experts in stability aspects related with mine shafts and cannot comment other than to state that a stand off distance may be appropriate. Road noise could be mitigated through location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability | |
| Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|--|---|
| Site Reference: | BRO032 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| 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: | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 2% |
| surface flood risk zone: | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 5% |
| surface flood risk zone: 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 | NI- |
| Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: | Vary High and Madium |
| (from the LVSS) | Very High and Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | High and Medium-Low |
| (from the LVSS) | riigii ana wediam-tow |
| 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 | N |
| Development at the Access Point? | IN . |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at | |
| Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | N. Floyer Lane is unsuitable for the additional traffic that is likely to be generated by the development which may |
| Reasonably be Made So? | potential involve 72 homes. Third party land would be needed to improve Floyer Lane. |
| Highway Comments - Could the | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | N |
| Works? | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | N. The Floyer Lane / Benthall Lane junction would need to be improved and third party land would be needed. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, | 14 |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport | |
| Service): | |
| Ecology Comments | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | None |
| Significant constraints. | |
| | |
| | EclA required Suprove for habitate (in particular graceland) CCN (named 45 and 15 and |
| | EcIA required. Surveys for habitats (in particular grassland), GCN (pond 15m to north), Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants, reptiles (Grass-snake recorded nearby). Old buildings could be used as bird nesting sites, |
| Ecology Comments | roosts for bats, and hibernation sites for reptiles and amphibians. Top corner of site is in the Environmental |
| Other Constraints: | Network and, with additional survey, additional core / priority habitat or corridor could be identified. Likely to be |
| | key foraging site for bats and birds of prey like Owls and Kestrel. |
| | ,gge and and an proj into and restren |
| | |
| | Current graceland between Mouser's Contember Brotest described and initiation and advantage of the |
| Ecology Comments | Survey grassland between May and September. Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to in accordance |
| Management of Constraints: | with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| | WILLI COLT ELIVITORIMENTAL INCLINOTES AND IVIDEZ. |
| | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Retain and improve hedges and hedgerow trees. Retain overgrown areas to north with ruins as hibernation site for amphibians and reptiles. This area of environmental network should be improved. A pond feature should be incorporated. Position between two Local Wildlife Sites of similar habitat suggests lots of opportunities to enhance area. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|--|---|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site located on the boundary of, and within the setting, of the Broseley Conservation Area. HER indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of post-medieval clay and ironstone minding remains are present across much the site (HER PRN 33213), so site hold archaeological interest. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation; impact on setting of CA). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA. |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | hedgerows and mature trees to southern and western 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: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement |
| Public Protection Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Mine shafts and associated contamination potential on site. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Remediation where necessary for contaminated land |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability | |
| Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | BRO036 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | V |
| 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: | 2% |
| 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 | |
| historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | |
| detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | |
| Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Medium-Low |
| 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? | IN . |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at | |
| Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | Y. Pound Lane adjacent to site would need to be improved for traffic and pedestrians. |
| | 1. Pound Lane adjacent to site would need to be improved for tranic and pedestrians. |
| Reasonably be Made So? | |
| Highway Comments - Could the | N. |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | N |
| works? | N. Deund Land landing to the D4272 and the impetion with the D4272 would need to be improved and third north |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | N. Pound Lane leading to the B4373 and the junction with the B4373 would need to be improved and third party |
| Site Works Achievable? | land would be needed. Y. If access can be achieved through the adjacent employment allocation directly onto the |
| Highway Assaultin Bury (2 : 200) | B4373. |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, | 17 |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport | |
| Service): | |
| Ecology Comments | |
| Ecology Comments | None |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| | |
| | |
| | Partly within Env. Network. Paddocks to east may be unimproved grassland. Surveys of tightly grazed grasslands |
| Ecology Comments | are difficult and would require grass to be left to grow before survey. Area of scrub / woodland has interest, |
| Other Constraints: | could support protected species (including Dormice) and should be in the Env. Network. Area of overgrown |
| other constraints. | grassland to north of this may also have interest in own right and may support reptiles. |
| | grassiana to north or this may also have interest in own right and may support reptiles. |
| | |
| | |
| | Fol A required Peduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible |
| Ecology Comments | EclA required. Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible |
| Management of Constraints: | in open space provision. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| | accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| | |
| | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Retain and improve hedges, hedgerow trees and woodland/ scrub. Grassland area could be improved with more sympathetic management as meadow. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|--|--|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | HER indicates that eastern side of site previously formed part of The Dunge Brick and Tile Works (HER PRN 07237) and the associated Dunge Colliery and associated coal workings (HER PRN 07285), so site hold archaeological interest. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation). |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: Tree Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | boundary hedgerows and double internal hedgerow and copse of trees |
| 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 central hedgerows and copse in open space and plant to connect to adjoining hedgerows. |
| Public Protection Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Potential contaminated land from past land use. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Remediation likely to be possible for con land. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability | |
| Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| Reasoning | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Cool Authority Reference Area? Monity or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Approximation and Broad 20ne 2: Percentage of site in Flood 20ne 2: Percentage of the site in Flood 30ne 2: Percentage of the site of the 1000 year author 50nd site 50ne: Percentage of the site within 20ne of an Associated within 20ne of an Associated and an Associated and an Associated 20ne 3: Percentage of the site within 20ne of an Associated within 20ne of an Associated within 20ne of an Associated and associated and associated within 20ne of an Associated with the Benefit State of Associated with the Benefit State State State State State State State | Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|--|---|---|
| Moments of Seguarding Area? Yes Wholly or Partly Greds 1, 2 and or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of six in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of six in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of six in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of the six in the 30 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 30 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six with John 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: Percentage of the six within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: Percentage of the six within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: Percentage of the six within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m | Site Reference: | BRO037 |
| Moments of Seguarding Area? Yes Wholly or Partly Greds 1, 2 and or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of six in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of six in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of six in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of the six in the 30 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 30 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface Board Six Area: Percentage of the six with John 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: Percentage of the six within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: Percentage of the six within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: Percentage of the six within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m of an Institute Board Six Area: No Protection 20m of the six Within 20m | Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Monitor Partly Grade 1.2 and/or 3 Agriculturo 11 and in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of sine in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of sine in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an Percentage of the site within 20m of a Percentage | | Yes |
| Agricultural cland Chally: 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 Survice Road risk or Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the site in the 30 year Survice Road risk or Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Survice Road risk or the 2,000 year Survive Road risk of Surv | Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | N- |
| Percentage of site in Flood 2 and 2: Percentage of site in Flood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk some: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk some: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk some: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk some: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk some: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk some: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk some: 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 destalled river naturals. All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Undiscape Considerations: (Indiscape Considerations: (Ind | Agricultural Land Quality: | NO |
| Percentage of site in Flood 20ne 1: 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 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood event. All or part of the site within 5 source Protection Zone: No Protection Zone: No Protection Zone: No Protection Zone: Medium (Into the USS) (Fightway Comments - Fig. 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, | Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30-year surfoce flood risk one: Percentage of the site in the 1.00 year surfoce flood risk one: Percentage of the site in the 1.00 year surfoce flood risk one: Percentage of the site in the 1.00 year surfoce flood risk one: Percentage of the site in the 1.00 year surfoce flood risk one: Percentage of the site in the 1.00 year surfoce flood risk one: Percentage of the site in the 1.00 year surfoce flood risk one: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a declaridar view on the surfoce of the site within 20m of a declaridar view on the surfoce flood risk of the surfoce of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Percentage Considerations: (from the LVSS) (from the | Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| surface flood risk sone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk sone: Percentage of the site within 2000 year surface flood risk sone: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood when the filter of the site within 20m of on historic flood when the site within 20m of on historic flood when the site within 20m of on detrolled riven network. All or part of the site within 20m of o detrolled riven network: No Percentage of the site within 20m of o detrolled riven network: No Reprentage of the site within 20m of o detrolled riven network: No Reprentage of the site within 30 source Protection Zone: Indiscupe Considerations: Indiscupe Considerations: Indigen the LVS3 Indi | Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| surface (lood risk zone: Recrectings of the site in the 1,000 year surface (lood risk zone: Recrectings of the site within 20m of an historic flood Map: Recrectings of the site within 20m of an historic flood Way: Recrectings of the site within 20m of an historic flood went: No detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: No detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: No detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: No detailed river network: Medium Wassul impact Considerations: (from the USS) Medium-Low Righway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Righway Comments - Direct Access, Con One Recosmbil be Achieved? And Courrently a bridleway No Source of the Station Highway Sources with the Development of the Access Point is No Station Le, Can it Reasonably be Achieved of the Recosmbil be Ackeed of the Station Highway Comments - If Existing Highway of Recosments - Could the Development Cour Without Off-Site Works Achievedibe? Highway Comments - Could the Development Cour Without Off-Site Works Achievedibe? Highway Comments - Could the Development Cour Without Off-Site Works Achievedibe? Highway Comments - Could the Development Cour Without Off-Site Works Achievedibe? Highway Comments - Could the Development Cour Without Off-Site Works Achievedibe? Fortential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bast. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Fortential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bast. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. | Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 20/ |
| surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the sire in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the sire within 20m of an Percentage of the sire within 20m of an O% Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an O% Percentage of the sire within 20m of an O% Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an O% Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an O% Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an O% Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an O% Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an O% Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an O% Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an O% Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an O% Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an O% Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an O% Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an O% Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an Instants flood event of the sire within 20m of an Instants flood event of an an and an Instants flood event of an and and and and and and and and and | surface flood risk zone: | Σ70 |
| surface pload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of a historic flood way: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. Protection 2 min. Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. No Expectation of the site within a Source Protection 2 min. No Expectation 2 min. No Ex | Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 10/ |
| Surface (Bood Insk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic (Bood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic (Bood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic (Bood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic (Bood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic (Bood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic (Bood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic (Bood event: No (Matthews 1) No (Protection Zone: Protection Zone: No (Protection Zone: No (Protection Zone: Protection Zone: No (Protection Zone: No (Protec | surface flood risk zone: | 470 |
| Surface in pool risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood Map: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: No dedium (from the USS) Wiscoll impart Considerations: (from the USS) Medium (from the USS) Wiscoll impart Considerations: (from the USS) Medium (from the USS) Wiscoll impart Considerations: (from the USS) Medium (from the USS) Yes and the considerations: (from the USS) Valid impart Considerations: (from the USS) Medium (from the USS) Yes and the considerations: (from the USS) Medium (from the USS) Yes and the considerations: (from the USS) Medium (from the USS) Yes and the considerations: (from the USS) Medium (from the USS) Yes and the considerations: (from the USS) (f | Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 10% |
| Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed view network: All or part of the site within 50mrce Protection Zome: Indiscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) (from the LVSS) (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - Fixed Resonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point? Highway Comments of Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, for Triffs Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Guid the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Ace Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Ace Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Potential grassland Interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development. If poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for Survey. | surface flood risk zone: | 10% |
| Historic Hood Mag: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic Bood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All or port of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All or port of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All or port of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All or port of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: No Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Medium-Low (from the LVSS) All of the considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium-Low (from the LVSS) Medium-Low (from the LVSS) (Currently a bridleway Highway Comments: - Direct Access, Company Comments: - Poblect Access, Company Comments: - Poblect Access, Company Comments: - Poblect Access, Company Comments: - Evisting Highway Statable for Troffic Associated with the Development of the Access Point? Highway Comments: - Fixthing Highway of Access Point is Not Suitable, Con It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments: - Fixthing Highway of Access Point is Not Suitable, Con It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments: - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments: - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Scoressbillity Rating (Out Of 24) Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenients Story School, GP Surgery, Convenients Story School, GP Surgery, Convenients Story School, GP Surgery, Convenients Significant Constraints: Potential grassland Interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. | Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 00/ |
| historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 50mce Protection 20me: Indiscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Insulating Considerations: (from the LVSS) Insulating Considerations: Insulating Consideratio | Historic Flood Map: | 076 |
| Instance, Dood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Inandscape Considerations: If mit the LVS3) Wisual Impact Considerations: If mit the LVS3) Wisual Impact Considerations: If mit the LVS3) Wisual Impact Considerations: If mit the LVS3 Wisual Impact Considerations: If the Mit the | Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% |
| detailed river network: All for part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: No Medium Medium Medium Medium-Low Me | historic flood event: | 070 |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Industry Considerations: If me the USS) Medium Medium-Low Medium-Median-Low Medi | Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 0% |
| Protection Zone: Indicate Considerations: If m the LVSS Medium Medium-Low M | detailed river network: | 078 |
| Medium Indiandscape Considerations: Iffrom the LVSS) Medium-Low Medium-Low | All or part of the site within a Source | No |
| Medium M | Protection Zone: | |
| Wedium-Low Wed | | Medium |
| Ifform the LVSS Y Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Con One Reasonably Be Achieved? And how? Currently a bridleway Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If SutSting Highway ot Access Point is No Suitable, Con It Reasonably be Mode So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Y. But suitable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto the Reasonably be Mode So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Y W. But suitable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto the Reasonably be Mode So? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Off-Site Works? Achievable? Y W. But suitable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto the Reasonably be Mode So? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Off-Site Works Achievable? Y W. But suitable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto the Reasonably be Mode So? W. But suitable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto the Reasonably be Mode So? W. But suitable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto the Reasonably be Mode So? W. But suitable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto the Reasonably be Mode So? W. But suitable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto the Reasonably to Reasonable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto the Reasonable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto the Reasonable visibility and access road width may not | | THE GIGHT |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Con One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can it Reasonably be Made 5:07 Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Saccessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | • | Medium-Low |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Suitable for Triffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can it Reasonably be Made 50? Highway Comments - Guitable, Can it Reasonably be Made 50? Highway Comments - Could the Development occur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Saccessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | mediain 200 |
| 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? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Sacessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | γ |
| Currently a bridleway How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway of 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | · |
| 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 No 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? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September: Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| 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? Highway Comments - Out the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | • | Currently a bridleway |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Exiting Highway or Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | N. |
| 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Follogy Comments Other Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | N |
| 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? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | · | |
| 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 Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | Y. But suitable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto the |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | · · | B4373 without acquiring third party land. |
| 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 Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | · | |
| 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): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | - ' | V |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | T . |
| Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | vvoiks: | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Site Works Achievable? | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) | |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | 23 |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Service): | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Ecology Comments | None |
| Differ Constraints: priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Significant Constraints: | Notie |
| Differ Constraints: priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Differ Constraints: priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Differ Constraints: priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Differ Constraints: priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | 5 / 6 | Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be |
| of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned. Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | | |
| Ecology Comments Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for | Otner Constraints: | • |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | Ecology Comments | Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for |
| | Management of Constraints: | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Ensure hedgehog friendly development that includes gaps in fence gravel boards, etc. Plan areas of open space that compliment the priority habitats to the west and south. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|--|---|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | HER indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of early post-medieval coal workings (bell pits) are present across the site (HER PRN 04565), so site hold archaeological interest. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation). |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: Tree Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | boundary trees and copse internal to central part 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: | |
| Public Protection Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Potential contaminated land from past land use. |
| other constraints. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Remediation likely to be possible for con land. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability | |
| Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation Reasoning | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | BRO039 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | Tes Tes |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | No |
| 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 | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | |
| historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | |
| detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | |
| Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Medium-High |
| 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 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? | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, | |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport | 21 |
| Service): | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | None |
| Significant Constraints: | NOTIC |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Foolers Comments | Top field of site is in the Environmental Network. Species found nearby and potentially on site are Hedgehog, |
| Ecology Comments | Dingy Skipper, Slow-worm, Common Lizard, other butterfly and moth species that have been recorded nearby at |
| Other Constraints: | The Haycop Local Wildlife Site nearby. Some potential for the same species to occur on the boundaries and also |
| | the rough area to the north east of the site. |
| | |
| | |
| | EcIA required. In particular of edges of site and rough corner at the north east of the site. Boundary trees and |
| Ecology Comments | hedgerows should be retained where possible. Survey of reptiles over summer (avoiding July and August when |
| Management of Constraints: | possible). A wide buffer to the south where the Haycop Local Wildlife Site is close by. Reduced numbers of |
| | housing as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision. |
| | , |
| | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Ensure hedgehog friendly development that includes gaps in fence gravel boards, etc. Plan areas of open space that compliment the priority habitats to the west and south. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|--|---|
| Heritage Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Large site which included the site of the site of Yew Tree Mine (HER PRN 33000) and therefore has archaeological interest. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation). |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | isolated trees and hedgerows within and around site boundaries. Borders wider woodland network to north and east |
| 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. Connect to woodland to north and east |
| Public Protection Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Potential contaminated land from past land use in the area. Possible road noise issues. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Remediation likely to be possible for con land. Noise can be mitigated by glazing and orientation of buildings to shelter garden areas |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability | Good |
| Appraisal: | |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Site Reference: BRO040 Cool Authority Reference Area? Yes 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 2: 100% Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: 0% Percentage flood risk zone: 0% Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: 0% Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: 2% Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood Map: 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed riven network: 0% All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: No Protection Zone: No Redium High (from the LVSS) Medium-High (from the LVSS) Medium |
|--|
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: 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 in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an 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: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wedium-High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Omments - Direct Access to Highway Omments - Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: 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 in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an 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: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wedium-High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Omments - Direct Access to Highway Omments - Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? |
| Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: 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 flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 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 Mop: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a 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: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium-High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Sultable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? |
| Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1.00 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 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: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: (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? |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in Ho 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 in the 1,000 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: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Medium-High 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? |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in Ho 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 in the 1,000 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: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Medium-High 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? |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: 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 in the 1,000 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: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) 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? |
| 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 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: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact 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 Suttable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? |
| surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an 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: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wisual Impact Considerations: (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? |
| 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: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wedium-High 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? |
| 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: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (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? Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? |
| 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: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? |
| 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 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: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (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? |
| 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: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wisual Impact Considerations: (fform 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? |
| 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: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wedium Medium-High 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? |
| 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: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wedium-High 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? |
| 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: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium-High 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? |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wedium-High 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? |
| detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wedium-High 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? |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium-High (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? |
| Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium-High (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? |
| 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 Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? |
| (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 Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? |
| 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 Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? |
| (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 - 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 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 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? |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? |
| How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? |
| Development at the Access Point? |
| · |
| |
| Assumes speed limit has been extended as a result of the Linney Grange development on the opposite side |
| Reasonably be Made So? Coalport Rd. Planning a shared access point with BRO041 could be considered if both sites progress. |
| Highway Comments - Could the |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site Y |
| Works? |
| WOTKS: |
| 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): |
| Sci vicej. |
| Ecology Comments |
| Significant Constraints: None |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| Ecology Comments |
| Other Constraints: Potential grassland interest including in the wide road verge on north west corner. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| Ecology Comments EcIA required. Survey grassland between May and September. Include survey of road verge in north west c |
| Management of Constraints: Significant boundary trees are present which should, with hedgerows, be retained where possible. |
| |
| |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Seek to open up the footpath to the west and combine with open space provision. See also standard list of opportunities. |
|---|--|
| Heritage Comments | N/A |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | N/A (NB. Condition advised for an archaeological watching brief on a 2015 application) |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Archaeological watching brief condition on any PP |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: Tree Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | hedgerows and mature trees around 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: | 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 contamination from off site sources. Potential road noise. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Remediation available. Potential to mitigate noise by location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| Public Protection Comments | |
| Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability | Good |
| Appraisal: Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| Reasoning | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | BRO041 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | No |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | V |
| 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: | 3% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 8% |
| 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: | 21% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | |
| Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Medium-High |
| 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. Existing speed limit on Coalport Road will need to be extended. Planning a shared access point with BRO040 |
| Reasonably be Made So? | could be considered if both sites progress. |
| Highway Comments - Could the | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | γ |
| 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 | 20 |
| Service): | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | No |
| Significant Constraints: | None |
| | |
| | |
| | The area is bisected by Environmental Network that follows the hedge and watercourse across the site. This |
| | water course flows into Corbett's Dingle Local Wildlife Site and Ancient Woodland which clearly has implications |
| Ecology Comments | for drainage. Culverting of watercourses is rarely approved as part of Open Water Consents that would likely be |
| Other Constraints: | |
| | required for this site. Mature in-field and boundary trees are present. The grassland at this site may be of |
| | interest. |
| | |
| | |
| Facility Courses | EcIA required. Survey grassland between May and September. Significant boundary trees are present which |
| Ecology Comments | should, with hedgerows, be retained where possible. Water course should be built into any design as an open |
| Management of Constraints: | water feature and incorporated into SUDS. |
| | |
| | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | In addition to the standard list of opportunities the water course could be enhanced with good design that doesn't reply on culverting. The Environmental Network should be enhanced. |
|---|---|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Medium sized site, so may have some archaeological potential |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment +?evaluation). |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedgerows and mature trees around site boundaries and within site. |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Seek to retain internal tree and hedgerow within open space within site |
| 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 contamination from off site sources. Potential road noise. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Remediation available. Potential to mitigate noise by location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning Reasoning | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and appleament guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
| | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | BRO043 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | Vos |
| 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 | 00/ |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 1% |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1/0 |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 4% |
| surface flood risk zone: | 470 |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% |
| Historic Flood Map: | 070 |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% |
| historic flood event: | G/0 |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 10% |
| detailed river network: | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | NO NO |
| Protection Zone: | |
| Landscape Considerations: | Medium |
| (from the LVSS) | |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | Medium-High |
| (from the LVSS) | |
| 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 | N |
| Development at the Access Point? | ··· |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at | |
| Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | Y. Existing speed limit on Coalport Road will need to be extended. |
| Reasonably be Made So? | |
| Highway Comments - Could the | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | Υ |
| Works? | |
| Highway Comments Are Envisaged Off | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | |
| SILE VVOINS ACHIEVUDIE! | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, | 20 |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport | |
| Service): | |
| Ecology Comments | |
| Ecology Comments | None |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| | The eastern boundary that follows the hedgerow and watercourse forms an Env. Network corridor. This |
| | watercourse flows into Corbetts Dingle Local Wildlife Site and Ancient Woodland, which has implications for |
| | drainage. Culverting of watercourses is rarely approved as part of Open Water Consents that would likely be |
| Ecology Comments | required for this site. |
| Other Constraints: | Potential grassland interest including in the wide road verge on north west corner. |
| | Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting |
| | birds. |
| | Hedgerows, trees and watercourse will need to be buffered. |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | Water course should be built into any design as an open water feature and incorporated into SUDS. |
| 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 Env. Network in |
| management of constraints. | accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| | accordance with CST/ Environmental Networks and NIDTZ. |
| | |

| Foology Comments | Cook to approun the footpath to the west and combine with open space provision |
|---|---|
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Seek to open up the footpath to the west and combine with open space provision. The watercourse could be enhanced with good design that doesn't rely on culverting. |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Medium sized site, so may have some archaeological potential. Condition advised for an archaeological watching brief on a 2015 application on part of the site. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment +?evaluation). Archaeological watching brief condition on any PP. |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | individual TPO trees around boundary and within site |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedgerows and mature trees on site boundaries |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Seek to retain internal trees within open space within site |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | enhance tree cover within site, to deliver net gain for biodiversity. |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Site is in area of known coal mining and contaminated land vicinity. Site investigation would be required. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Good |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation Reasoning | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | employment guidennes identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
| | |

| Total Authority Reference Accord Mineral Softgrounds Accord Whelly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural land Country Recentage of Ste in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of Ste in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of Ste in | Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|--|---|--|
| Millered Sidepsunding Area? Wes Whitely or Partly Facility 1, 2 and 7 a | Site Reference: | JKD002 |
| Whelly or Porthy Grade 1. 2 and ard 3 Agricultum I and Oxology: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the site of the 20 year Note of the State of the 30 year Note of the 30 year of th | Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Agricultural Land Guality. Percentage of site in Fload Zone 3: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 3: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 3: Percentage of the site in fload Zone 4: Percentage of the site in fload Zone 4: Percentage of the site in fload Zone 5: Percentage of the site in fload Zone 5: Percentage of the site in fload Zone 6: Percentage of the site in fload Zone 6: Percentage of the site in fload Zone 7: Percentage of the site within 25 one | Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Agricultural cland Cutoffly. Verenange of site in Flood Zone 3: ON. Verenange of site in Flood Zone 1: 100% Verenange of site in Flood Zone 1: 100% Verenange of site in Flood Zone 1: 100% Verenange of the site in the 30 year under Flood Zone 1: Verenange of the site in the 30 year under Flood Zone 1: ON. Verenange of the site in the 100 year under Flood Zone 1: Verenange of the site in the 100 year under Flood Zone 1: ON. ON. ON. ON. ON. ON. ON. ON | Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | N- |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the Ist In the Joy Power Judge Gold Tists Kone: Percentage of the Ist In the JOy Power Judge Gold Tists Kone: Percentage of the Ist In the JOY Power Judge Gold Tists Kone: Percentage of the Ist In the JOY Power Judge Gold Tists Kone: Percentage of the Ist In the JOY Power Judge Gold Tists Kone: Percentage of the Ist In the JOY Power Judge Gold Tists Kone: Percentage of the Ist In the JOY Power Judge Gold Tists Kone: Percentage of the Ist In the JOY Power Judge Gold Tists Kone: Percentage of the Ist In the JOY Power Judge Gold Tists Within Source Protection Zone: Percentage of the Ist In the JOY Power Judge Gold Tists Within Source Protection Zone: Percentage of the Ist In the JOY Power Judge Gold Tists Within Source Protection Zone: No Transfer Gold Tists Within Source Protection Zone: No Transfer Gold Tists Within Source Protection Tists Within Source Protection Zone: No Transfer Gold Tists Within Source Protect Access to 10 Miles Within Source Protection Zone: No Transfer Tists Within Source Protect Access to 10 Miles Work Access To 10 Miles Work Access To 10 Miles Work Access Food Tists Work Access Power Is to Stubble, Cont of the Receipment of Cut Without Off-Site Work Achieve/Dir Pills Wo | Agricultural Land Quality: | NO |
| Percentage of the in Flood 20ne 1: Percentage of the let in Flood 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an site rich old Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an site rich old Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an site rich old Map: Percentage of the site within 3 Source Proceedings of the site within 4 Source Received of the site within 5 Source Received of the site within 5 Source Received of the site within 6 S | Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of the in Flood 20ne 1: Percentage of the let in Flood 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an site rich old Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an site rich old Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an site rich old Map: Percentage of the site within 3 Source Proceedings of the site within 4 Source Received of the site within 5 Source Received of the site within 5 Source Received of the site within 6 S | | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year supplies (Part State State) Percentage of the site in the 100 year supplies (Part State State) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year supplies (Part State) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year supplies (Part State) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year supplies (Part State) Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year supplies (Part State) Percentage of the site within 20m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Prom the LYS) No anadisone Considerations: No Assessed No Assessed No Assessed No Assessed Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Prom the LYS) No Assessed No Assessed No Assessed Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event: Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event flood event events. Percentage of the site within 30m of on sistoric flood event | | 100% |
| surface, flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface, flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface, flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 2,000 year surface, flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 2,000 year surface, flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 2,000 year shistoric flood Magn: Percentage of the site within 2,000 year and risk site flood Magn: Percentage of the site within 2,000 year and risk site flood wear. No reporting the site within 2,000 year and risk site flood event: No grant of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site within 2,000 year and risk report of the site of | | 201 |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year uptice flood its knone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year uptice flood its knone: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood when. Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. Percentage of the site within 30m of on historic flood ween. Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. Percentage of the site within 30m of on historic flood ween. Percentage of the site within 30m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 30m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 30m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 30m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on historic flood ween. No Onfolia of the site within 20m of on his | | 0% |
| 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 identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an Office Statistic Map developed on the Early Statistic flood event within 20m of an Office Statistic Flood Flood Event William Statistic Flood Flood Flood Flood Event William Statistic Flood | | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year supplice flood is site size one: Percentage of the site identified on the EA issocial Elood Mop: Percentage of the site within 20m of an issocial Elood Mop: Percentage of the site within 20m of an issocial Elood Work of the site within 20m of an issocial Elood Eloog. We recentage of the site within 20m of an of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network: No part of the site within 30m of a detailed rive network of | | 0% |
| surface (Pload Hake zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood Wage: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood Vege: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood Vege: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood Vege: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood Vege: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site within 50m of on historic flood Veget: Percentage of the site of the site of the veget: Percentage of the site of the site of the veget: Percentage of the site of the site of the veget: Percentage of the site of the site of the veget: Percentage of the site of the site of the veget: Percentage of the site of the site of the veget: Percentage of the site of the site of the veget: Percentage of the site of the site of the site of the veget: Percentage of the site of the site of the site of the veget: Percentage of the site of the si | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an isstance flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an isstance flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an isstance flood event: No Assessed flood event: No Considerations: Not Assessed flood event: Not | | 0% |
| Pistance Flood Map: 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 an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an own of an own of an own of the site within 20m of an own own own own own own own own own ow | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an issistance fload event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a certain statistic fload event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a certain statistic fload event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a certain statistic fload event within a Source votection Zone: In on Considerations: Not Assessed Mind of Considerations: Not Assessed N | | 0% |
| historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: And compared Considerations: From the LVSS) Not Assessed Not Asses | · | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a deteilader liver network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: No All or part of the site within a Source No Condiscage Considerations: Not Assessed Sixual Impact Considerations: No | | 0% |
| Joseph Considerations Survey of the site within a Source Not Assessed Survey of the site within a Source Not Assessed Survey of the site within a Source Not Assessed Survey of the site within a Source Not Assessed Survey of the site of the site of the survey of the site of the survey of the surv | | |
| All to part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: No Protection Zone: Not Assessed Sixual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Not Assessed (sixual Impact Assessed Impact As | detailed river network: | 0% |
| Industrial Considerations: Inform the LVS3 Information Considerations: Information the LVS3 Information Considerations: Information the CVS3 Information Considerations: Information Consideration Considerations: Information Considerations: Information Considerations: Information Considerations: Information Consideration Con | | |
| Indiscope Considerations: from the LVSS Visual Impact Considerations: Not Assessed Visual Impact Considerations: Visual Impact Access Point Impact Considerations: Visual Impact Considera | Protection Zone: | No |
| Not Assessed | | |
| Not Assessed (fighway 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? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Offset Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Offset Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of intervet. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecicla required. The woodland should be surveyed in Spring or early summer to ensure spring flowers are picked up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | • | Not Assessed |
| Ifform the USS) Ifform the USS) Ifform the USS) Ifform was recommented to the Direct Access to Highway Network? Ifformay Network? Ifformay Network? Ifformation of Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Ifformation of Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Iffighway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? Iffighway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? Iffighway Comments - Oculd the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? If Event and the Direct Access Point? If Event Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made 50? Iffighway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works? If Iffighway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works? If Iffighway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) Iffighways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) Iffigh | | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Wiltoble 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? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Saccessibility Rating (Out Of 24) Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Cecology Comments Ecology Comments Windows Accessifications Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Figure Constraints: Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Figure Constraints: Figur | | Not Assessed |
| Highway Comments - if No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Haccess Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Haccess Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Haccess Point is Not Suitable, Can It Heasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Wannesment of Constraints: Ecila required. The woodland should be surveyed in Spring or early summer to ensure spring flowers are picked up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | | |
| 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? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of Interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Lectal required. The woodland should be surveyed in Spring or early summer to ensure spring flowers are picked up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | | Υ |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - (Fusting Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Out the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dornice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecla required. The woodland should be surveyed in Spring or early summer to ensure spring flowers are picked up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | - | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Wilsolate for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Wilsolate for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Wilsolate for Traffic Associated with the Development of Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Wilsolate for Constraints: Works? Works? Works? Works Achievable? Wilsolate for Site Works Achievable? All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Wilsolate for Traffic Associated with the Site of Traffic Associated with the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Wilsolate for Traffic Associated with the Site of Traffic Associated with the Environmental Note of Traffic Associated with the Site of Traffic | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Troffic 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? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Saccessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Other Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comme | , | |
| 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? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Saccessibility Rating (Out Of 24) Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24 | | |
| 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Wannagement of Constraints: | | Y |
| 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Saccessibility Rating (Out Of 24) Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Lector Constraints: Ect A required. The woodland should be surveyed in Spring or early summer to ensure spring flowers are picked up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | | · |
| 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 Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Reading Constraints: Ecila required. The woodland should be surveyed in Spring or early summer to ensure spring flowers are picked up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | | |
| 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 Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Lecology Co | | |
| 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 Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Hangagement of Constraints: Ecology Comments Wangagement of Constraints: Ecology Comments Wangagement of Constraints: Ecology Comments Wangagement of Constraints: | | |
| 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 Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Ecology Comments And Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | · · | |
| 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): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | | Y |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Waggement of Constraints: Ecology Comments Waggement of Constraints: Ecology Comments Waggement of Constraints: | | ' |
| All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | WOTKS: | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Waggagement of Constraints: Ecology Comments Maggagement of Constraints: | Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Wangagement of Constraints: | Site Works Achievable? | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Wangagement of Constraints: | Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) | |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | | 19 |
| All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | | |
| All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | 23. 7.007. | |
| All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Ecology Comments | |
| All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Significant Constraints: | None |
| could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | | |
| could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | | |
| could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | | |
| could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | | All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice |
| Clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Ecology Comments | |
| Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: Ecology Comments Up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | Other Constraints: | · |
| Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | | |
| up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | | |
| up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | | |
| up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | | |
| up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become | Forders Commit | EcIA required. The woodland should be surveyed in Spring or early summer to ensure spring flowers are picked |
| Management of Constraints' | 5, | |
| | Management of Constraints: | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | In addition to the standard list of opportunities the woodland could be enhanced. The Environmental Network should be enhanced and woodland edge habitat promoted. If reptiles are found then ground features that can be used for hibernation and basking should be incorporated into the open space. |
|--|---|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site located within Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site and Severn Gorge Conservation Area. Site formed part of the Rock Tile Works (HER PRN 07242) and also contains mine workings (HER PRN 07283), so holds archaeological interest. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation; impact on Outstanding Universal Value of WHS and character and appearance of CA). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA and WHS. |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | Belt of TPO woodland occupies north-west to south-east side of site. |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | trees to north-east site 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. Development stand-off from protected woodland. |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | |
| Public Protection Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: Public Protection Comments | Potential contamination from historic land use on and in the vicinity of the site. Possible noise impact from |
| Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | industrial estate to the east. Remediation likely to be possible for contaminated land. Potential to mitigate noise by location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation Reasoning | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | JKD003 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | No |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | N- |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | No |
| 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: | 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: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | Very High |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | |
| (from the LVSS) | High |
| 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 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? | r · |
| VVOI KS : | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | |
| Site Works Achievable? | |
| Highways Accessibility Bating (Out Of 24) | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, | |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport | 19 |
| Service): | |
| Service). | |
| Ecology Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | none |
| organificant constraints. | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | Site is nearly surrounded by woodland, some of which is within the site. To the east and south this woodland is |
| Other Constraints: | also within the Ecological Network and is listed as priority habitat. Bats, badgers, nesting birds and Dormice could |
| Street Solida Militar | be present. Other areas of the site may also support reptiles |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | EcIA required. The woodland should be surveyed in Spring or early summer to ensure spring flowers are picked |
| Ecology Comments | up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become |
| Management of Constraints: | used to them. A buffer should be included to the woodland. |
| | asea to them. A buner should be included to the woodidha. |
| | |
| | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | In addition to the standard list of opportunities the woodland could be enhanced. The Environmental Network should be enhanced and woodland edge habitat promoted. If reptiles are found then ground features that can be used for hibernation and basking should be incorporated into the open space. |
|--|---|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site located within Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site and Severn Gorge Conservation Area. Site formed part of the Rock Tile Works (HER PRN 07242) and also contains mine workings (HER PRN 07283), so holds archaeological interest. ?some of the present buildings on site may be historic industrial buildings. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation; ?Level 2 historic building recording; impact on Outstanding Universal Value of WHS and character and appearance of CA). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA and WHS. |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Significant Constraints: Tree Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | site surrounded by mature trees - part of ironbridge gorge woodland network |
| 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 around periphery of site, in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees. |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover within site, in association with future development. |
| Public Protection Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Contaminated land due to past and existing land uses. Potential noise from industrial site to the east. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Remediation likely to be possible for contaminated land. Potential to mitigate noise by location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. Significant noise mitigation measures likely which may slightly reduce the number of properties possible on site. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | Potential to remove potential noise sources for nearby residential properties if this site was developed for residential. |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability | |
| Appraisal: | Fair |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation | |
| Design Requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|--|---|
| Site Reference: | JKD004 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | No |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | No |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | INO |
| 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 | 1% |
| surface flood risk zone: | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 9% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | |
| historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | |
| detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | NI. |
| Protection Zone: | No |
| Landscape Considerations: | Manual Birdh |
| (from the LVSS) | Very High |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | ∐igh |
| (from the LVSS) | High |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | Υ |
| Highway Network? | ' |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | B4373 |
| How? | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | V. |
| 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 | 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 | 20 |
| Service): | |
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. If priority habitats not present, boundary vegetation should be retained, enhanced and buffered, reducing developable area. |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | The site forms an Env. Network corridor. The site may contain priority habitat - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. 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, site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. See accompanying document |
|--|--|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site located adjacent to the boundary, and within the setting, of the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site and Severn Gorge Conservation Area. Historic editions of the OS map indicates that at least one mine shaft is present on the site. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on Outstanding Universal Value of WHS and character and appearance of CA; archaeological Desk Based Assessment + ?evaluation). High quality design for development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA and WHS. |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | abuts conservation area to the east. |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | open rough grassland site with scrubby trees and shrubs mostly around the perimeter. Adjoins extensive deciduous woodland to the south and east |
| 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 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: | Possible contaminated land due to past land use. Possible noise from road to west. Possible stability issues however this steps outside of my remit. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Con land remediation likely to be available. Mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? Recommendation | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Reasoning | A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| Capacity: | |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
| Design requirements: | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|--|--|
| Site Reference: | JKD004VAR |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | No |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 100% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 2% |
| surface flood risk zone: | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 6% |
| surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 17% |
| 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 | 200/ |
| detailed river network: | 20% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | No |
| Protection Zone: | |
| Landscape Considerations: | Very High |
| (from the LVSS) | - / |
| Visual Impact Considerations: | High |
| (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to | |
| Highway Network? | у |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | B4373 |
| How? | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | Development accessed off B4373 Ironbridge Road, likely to be able to accommodate development, subject to |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | achieving satisfactory access and potential improvements to ironbridge road. |
| Development at the Access Point? | deflicting satisfactory access and potential improvements to monortage road. |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at | |
| Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | У |
| Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | No |
| Works? | NO |
| | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | Yes - necessary improvements should be achievable |
| Site Works Achievable? | |
| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) | |
| (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, | 20 |
| Convenience Store & Public Transport | |
| Service): | CO Feeless conflicts to accompany development on this city |
| Ecology Comments | SC Ecology unlikely to support development on this site. The site forms an Environmental Network corridor, due to the presence of woodland and brook. CS17 |
| Significant Constraints: | Environmental Networks applies. Reduced numbers of housing would be required as protection of Environmental |
| | Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision. |
| | |
| | |
| 5.4 | |
| Ecology Comments | EcIA and botanical survey required and surveys for badgers, bats, GCNs, water voles, otters, white-clawed |
| Other Constraints: | crayfish, nesting birds and reptiles |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Ecology Comments | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancements. Protect, enhance and restore Env. |
| Management of Constraints: | Network in accordance with CS17and MD12 |
| | |
| | |

| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Not recommended for inclusion in allocated sites |
|--|---|
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site located within/adjoins Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site and Severn Gorge Conservation Area. Site contains mine workings (HER PRN 07283), so holds archaeological interest. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation; impact on Outstanding Universal Value of WHS and character and appearance of CA). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA and WHS. |
| Heritage Comments | |
| Opportunities: Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | site within/adjoins ironbridge / jackfield conservation area and world heritage site and is a natural extension of and buffer to it in terms of habitat and landscape. |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | extensive scrub and mature woodland covering north, east and south of site. |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | To protect and extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing landscape features. Plan for suitable development stand-off from woodland and links to new planting within the site. |
| Public Protection Comments | |
| Significant Constraints: Public Protection Comments | |
| Other Constraints: | Known noise source to east and north. Contaminated land and mining. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Parts of the site may be unsuitable due to proximity to industrial noise sources. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: | Poor |
| Strategic Considerations: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Potential for Allocation? | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. |
| Recommendation Reasoning | To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | employment guidelines identified for the town. |
| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |