Appendix H

Craven Arms 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:



Figure 1: Site Assessment Process

Site Assessment Process							
Stage 1: The Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)	Stage 1 consisted of a strategic screen and review of sites.						
Following the completion of the SLAA, further sites were promoted for consideration through the consultation and engagement process. Where possible these sites have been included within Stages 2a, 2b and 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal: Site Assessment process.							
	A, further information was achieved through the consultation and le this information has been considered within Stages 2a, 2b and 3 of the ment process.						
Stage 2a: Sustainability AppraisalStage 2a consisted of the assessment of the performance of site against the objectives identified within the Sustainability Appraisa							
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						

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;
 - The sites ground conditions;
 - The ability to access the site;
 - 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;
 - $\circ\;$ The impact on important trees and woodland, including ancient woodland; and
 - The impact on public open spaces.
 - Whether the site is located within the Green Belt.
 - Legal covenants affecting the site.
 - Market/industry and community requirements in the area.

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

*Natural environment assets considered for the purpose of this exercise and the distance used to determine where a site was in proximity of an asset were: Trees subject to TPO Protection; (30m); Veteran Trees (30m); Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites (50m); Local Nature Reserves (100m); Local Wildlife Sites (250m); National Nature Reserves (500m); Sites of Special Scientific Interest (500m); Ancient Woodland (500m); Special Areas of Conservation (1km); Special Protection Areas (1km); and Ramsar Sites (1km). It is accepted that the identification of these key historic and natural environment assets within a set distance of a site is only a useful starting point for consideration of potential impacts resulting from the development/redevelopment of a site and that a more holistic process is required when determining preferred site allocations. However, the SLAA represents a very strategic site assessment and only the first phase of a wider site assessment process. The selection of proposed allocations will be informed by a more holistic process by which sites are reviewed by relevant service areas to consider potential impacts on all assets.

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

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

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

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

Assessing Availability:

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

requirements of landowners. This will often mean that the land is controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop, or the landowner has expressed an intention to sell²¹.

- 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
- $\circ~$ The site is considered to be unavailable; and/or
- The site is considered unachievable/unviable.
- Long Term Potential Subject to Further Detailed Assessment:
 - The site is considered to be not currently suitable but may have future potential subject to further detailed assessment; and/or
 - o There is uncertainty about the sites availability; and/or
 - There is uncertainty about the sites achievability/viability.

• Accepted - Subject to Further Detailed Assessment:

- The site is considered currently suitable subject to further detailed assessment; and
- The site is considered available; and
- The site is considered achievable/viable.
- 2.12. Various data sources were used to identify sites for consideration within the SLAA, including existing Local Plan Allocations (including proposals within adopted and emerging Neighbourhood Plans); Planning Application records; Local Authority land ownership records; a 'Call for Sites'; and sites identified within previous Strategic Housing Land Availability (SHLAA) exercises. Ultimately, around 2,000 sites were considered within the SLAA process.

3. Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

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

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

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

-	
0	
+	

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

4. Screening of Sites

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

- 4.2. Specifically, sites did not proceed to Stage 3 of the site assessment process where:
 - There is uncertainty about whether the site is available for relevant forms of development. A site is generally considered to be available where they have been actively promoted for residential or mixed-use development during the preparation of the current Local Plan (Core Strategy and SAMDev Plan); during the most recent 'call for sites'; or during the ongoing Local Plan Review. It is also considered to be available for residential development where there has been a recent Planning Application for residential or mixed-use development on the site (whether successful or not); or where officers have particular knowledge about a sites availability.

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

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

*Significant physical constraints:

1. Where all or the majority of a site is located within Flood Zone 2 and/or 3 such that the site is considered undeliverable, it will not be 'screened out'. This is consistent with NPPF. Where a site can only be accessed through Flood Zones 2 and/or 3 this will be subject to detailed consideration within Stage 3 of the site assessment process. The preference would be to avoid (sequential approach) such site, however in circumstances where other constraints mean that a site with access through Flood Zones 2 and/or 3 is preferred for allocation, detailed assessment of the implications for an access through Flood Zone will be considered within Level 2 of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. This distinction recognises the different approach taken within the NPPF and NPPG with regard to site suitability when located within Flood Zone 2 and/or 3 and establishing safe access through Flood Zone 2 and/or 3.

2. The majority of the site contains an identified open space.

3. The site can only be accessed through an identified open space.

4. The topography of the site is such that development could not occur (this has been very cautiously applied).

5. The site is separated from the built form of the settlement (unless the land separating the site from the built form is also promoted and will progress through this screening).

6. The site is landlocked/does not have a road frontage (unless another promoted site will progress through this screening and could provide the site a road frontage for this site).7. The site is more closely associated with the built form of an alternative settlement

**Significant natural environment/heritage constraints:

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

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

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

Please Note:

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

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

5. Detailed Site Review

- 5.1. Stage 3 of the Site Assessment process considered those sites which were not 'screened out' of the assessment at Stage 2b. It involved a detailed review of sites and selection of proposed site allocations. This stage was informed by:
 - The results of Stage 1 of the Site Assessment process (which informs the assessment of sites).
 - The results of Stage 2a of the Site Assessment process (which informs the assessment of sites).
 - The results of Stage 2b of the Site Assessment process (which informs the site assessed).
 - Assessments undertaken by Highways*; Heritage; Ecology; Tree; and Public Protection Officers. In undertaking detailed reviews of sites within stage 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal: Site Assessment process, officers considered best available evidence**, where necessary undertook site visits and applied professional judgement in order to provide commentary on each site.

*The Highways Assessment included access to services for the Strategic, Principal and Key Centres, reflecting that these settlements are generally much larger than Community Hubs. **It should be noted that whilst the service area reviews were informed by the assessment of assets on and within proximity of the site undertaken within the SLAA process, they were not limited to consideration of these assets. The review was holistic in nature and in many instances identified additional assets which had not previously been identified. The commentary provided by the relevant service areas included a proportionate summary of:

- o The value/significance of any identified assets.
- The relationship between the site and any identified assets.
- Potential impact on any identified assets resulting from development / redevelopment of the site.
- If relevant, potential mechanisms for mitigating impact and/or recommendations on further assessment(s) required if the site is identified for allocation to inform the future development of the site.
 - Commissioned evidence base studies, including a Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Study; Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment; and Green Belt Review.
 - A Habitats Regulations Assessment.
 - Consideration of infrastructure requirements and opportunities.
 - Other strategic considerations* and professional judgement.

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

5.2. This stage of assessment was an iterative process.

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

Craven Arms Place Plan Area Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: Site Assessments

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref:											
	Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that	applv):	CRA001	CRA002	CRA003	CRA004	CRA005	CRA006	CRA007	CRA010	CRA011	CRA012	CRA013X	CRA014
	Special Area of Conservation		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	National Nature Reserve	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	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 Local Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone ¹ of one or more (record all that apply)		0	0	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	F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	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 (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland	100 = 2010 score(0)	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
	250m of a Wildlife Site		0	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100m of a Local Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	-
	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	hat apply):												
	Primary School	L	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
	GP surgery	L L	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-
F	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)		+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-
5	Leisure centre Children's playground	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+ +	- +	-+	-+	-+	-	-	-	-	+ +	+	-
	Outdoor sports facility	NO = Minus score (-)	+ +	+ +	+ +	+ +	+ +	-	-	-	-	+ +	+ +	-
	Amenity green space		+	- T	- T	- T	- T					- T	+	
	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)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an	Yes = plus score (+)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
11	area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
	Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that ap													1
	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
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		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Listed Building		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone ⁵ of one or more (record all that apply) 200m of a World Haritage Site or its buffer zone	:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<u> </u>
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone 300m of a Scheduled Monument	ŀ	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
	300m of a Conservation Area		-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
	300m of a Listed Building		-	0	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-
	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential	Double minus score ()				-							-	
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)	-											
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high	Zero score (0)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0
	landscape sensitivity for residential Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development beunder.	Plus score (+)										+	+	
	site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca													
L		Overall Score	4	-10	-5	-6	-5	-12	-14	-9	-10	3	8	-11
	Range is 9 to -14 Good is 9 to 2 Fair is 1 to-6 Poor is -7 to -14 Over	all Sustainability Conclusion	Good	Poor	Fair	Fair	Fair	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Good	Good	Poor
													2004	

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: CRA015	Site Ref: CRA016	Site Ref: CRA017	Site Ref: CRA018	Site Ref: CRA021	Site Ref: CRA023	Site Ref: CRA024	Site Ref: CRA025	Site Ref: CRA026	Site Ref: CRA027X	Site Ref: CRA028	Site Ref: CRA029
	Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that Special Area of Conservation	t apply):	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 () No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wildlife Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Local Nature Reserve	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone ¹ of one or more (record all that apply):												
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1km of a Ramsar Site]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	500m of a National Nature Reserve	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland	140 = 2010 30010 (0)	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0
	250m of a Wildlife Site	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0
	100m of a Local Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	-	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	0
	Site contains one or more (or part) of the following ² (record all that ap													1
	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	that apply):												
	Primary School	4	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+
	GP surgery	4	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
F	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)		-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
	Leisure centre	Yes = plus score (+)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
	Children's playground	No = minus score (-)	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
	Outdoor sports facility	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+
	Amenity green space Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	-	-	-	-	+ +	+	-	-	-	-	+ +	+ +	+
			-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+
0	Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times ⁴ :	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+
7	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	0
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	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
	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an	Yes = plus score (+)	0	0		0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	+
11	area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	No = zero score (0)	0	0		0		0	0	0	-	0	0	Ŧ
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	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	res = double minus score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Registered Park or Garden	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Conservation Area		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0		0	0
	a Listed Building		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone ⁵ of one or more (record all that apply):		-	~	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u> </u> '
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Scheduled Monument		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	4	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
	300m of a Listed Building Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for		0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	-	-	0	-
	residential	Double minus score ()												
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)				-								
	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential	Zero score (0)	0	0	0			0	0	0	0		0	
	Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary	Plus score (+)					+					+		+
	Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca													
		Overall Score		-12	-10	-3	6	-10	-11	-11	-12	-3	-4	9
	Range is 9 to -14 Good is 9 to 2 Fair is 1 to-6 Poor is -7 to -14 Ove	rall Sustainability Conclusion	Poor	Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Fair	Fair	Good

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: CRA030	Site Ref: CRA031	Site Ref: CRA032	Site Ref: CRA033	Site Ref: CRA034X	Site Ref: CRA0352
	Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that	apply):						-
	Special Area of Conservation		0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0	0
1	National Nature Reserve	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0
'	Site of Special Scientific Interest	score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wildlife Site		0	0	0	0	0	0
	Local Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone ¹ of one or more (record all that apply).	Ū	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	,. 	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1km of a Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0	0
			-	÷	÷	-	-	-
2	500m of a National Nature Reserve	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland		0	0	0	0	0	0
	250m of a Wildlife Site		0	0	0	0	0	0
	100m of a Local Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0
		Yes = minus score (-)						
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	-	-	0	0
	Site contains one or more (or next) of the following 2 (record all that any							
	Site contains one or more (or part) of the following ² (record all that app	biy):						
	Children's playground		0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Outdoor sports facility	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	-	0
	Amenity green space	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)		0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all	that apply):						
	Primary School		_	_	_	_	_	+
	GP surgery	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)		-	-	-	-	_	+
6	Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular	Yes = plus score (+)	+	+	+	+	+	+
U	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 (-)					<u> </u>	
7	versatile)	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	-	-	-	-	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
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	Yes = minus score (-)	-	0	0	0	-	-
-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	No = zero score (0)						
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	Site whony/party within an All Quality Management Area	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	U U	0	U U
	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an	Yes = plus score $(+)$	•					
11	area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Yes = $minus$ score (-)						
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation		0	0	0	0	0	0
		$No = zero \ score \ (0)$						
	Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that a	рріу):						
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone		0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Scheduled Monument	Voo deuble minut	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	a Registered Battlefield	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Registered Park or Garden	score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Conservation Area	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0
			-	-	-		-	
	a Listed Building		0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone ⁵ of one or more (record all that apply):						
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone		0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Scheduled Monument		-	-	-	0	0	-
14	300m of a Registered Battlefield	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Conservation Area		0	0	0	0	0	Ŭ
			U	U	U	U	-	-
	300m of a Listed Building		-	-	-	-	0	0
	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for	Double minus score ()						
	residential							
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)	-					
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high							
10		Zero score (0)				0		
	landscape sensitivity for residential	1-7						
	Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or	Plus score (+)		+	+			+
	site is inside the development boundary	. ,			· · ·			T
	Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca	ategory is recorded						
		Overall Score	-12	-5	-6	-10	2	6
		rall Sustainability Conclusion		Fair	Fair	Poor	Good	Good

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

Site Assessment - Stage 2b Site Reference:	CRA001
Site Address:	Abattoir site, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	0.85
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	26
Type of Site:	Brownfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Abattoir site comprising number of buildings and extensive hardstanding area. Site lies within Craven Arms, to the south of the Corvedale Road, before it crosses the river Onny. The associated lairage forms the eastern edge of the settlement in this location.
Surrounding Character:	Retail, commercial and residential to the west, road frontage to north with electricity substation on other side of road, agricultural land/river corridor with trees to south (river Onny) and grazing land (lairage) for abattoir animals to east.
Suitability Information:	
(from SLAA)	Currently Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Not Currently Available - Likely to become so
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. 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
Summary:	regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA002
Site Address:	South of Clun Road, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	5.18
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	155
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	This is one of a group of four sites running parallel with, and to the south of, Clun Road between the A49 and Park Lane. The others are CRA003, CRA004 and CRA005. This site forms the visible plateau of the hillock overlooking Clun Road and the southern edge of Craven Arms. The site is a large area of undeveloped land which extends along the railway embankment of the Heart of Wales rail line. It is in agricultural use (grazing) and contains one agricultural building. The site also contains a Scheduled Monument.
Surrounding Character:	The rail line to Knighton forms the southern boundary and there are a couple of houses to the north east. The site is in agricultural use within a countryside setting. It has no road frontage and its significant elevation above Craven Arms couple with the separation by the Clun Road enforces the physical and visual isolation of the land.
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to
Availability ¹ :	the next stage of the site assessment process.
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³ :	The site contains a scheduled monument. In isolation, the site is landlocked and does not appear to have a road frontage. Whilst there are other site promotions which could provide an access, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s).
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	I
Site Reference:	CRA003
Site Address:	Land at Burnside Close / Clun Road, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	3.42
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	103
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	This is one of a group of four sites running parallel with, and to the south of, Clun Road between the A49 and Park Lane. The others are CRA002, CRA004 and CRA005. This site is the most easterly and comprises a large, rectangular field situated next to the rail viaduct over Clun Road. It is accessed from the Burnside Close cul de sac. The site lies at the bottom of the steep hillock overlooking Clun Road and runs westward from the viaduct to the rear of the residential properties along Clun Road, finishing at the boundary with the dwellings of Orchard House and Ambleside.
Surrounding Character:	Character to south and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north is predominantly residential. To the east is a small part of an agricultural field, beyond which it is a mis of uses including residential, commercial and open spaces.
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site
Achievability/Viability Information:	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 to
Availability ¹ :	the next stage of the site assessment process.
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³ :	A small part of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. The site can only be accessed through flood zones 2 and/or 3 which would require consideration in the next stage of the site assessment process. Alternatively there are other site promotions which could provide an alternative access, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s).
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA004
Site Address:	Immediately to south of Clun Road, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	6.82
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	205
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	This is one of a group of four sites running parallel with, and to the south of, Clun Road between the A49 and Park Lane. The others are CRA002, CRA003 and CRA005. This site comprises a large, field adjoining CRA002 and is the most westerly site of the series. It is agricultural use (grazing) and a small brook runs west to east through the centre of the site. There are two agricultural buildings in the middle of the site. These are accessed by a track from Clun Road.
Surrounding Character:	The Heart of Wales railway line forms the southern boundary of the site, whilst Park Lane marks the western boundary and Clun Road the northern boundary. Beyond these, the land is essentially rural in character although there is bed and breakfast accommodation and some residential development to the north of Clun Road.
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to
Availability ¹ :	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.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA005
Site Address:	Land to the rear of Ambleside off Clun Road, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	0.40
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	12
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	This is one of a group of four sites running parallel with, and to the south of, Clun Road between the A49 and Park Lane. The others are CRA002, CRA003 and CRA004. This site is in agricultural use (grazing) and contains several mature trees. It is bounded by the Heart of Wales railway line to the south and lies at a higher elevation than Clun Road. There is no obvious vehicular access and this combined with its relatively remote nature and elevation gives it an isolated feel.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounded to west and east by agricultural land (grazing) and large house on detached grounds to north. The Heart of Wales railway line marks southern boundary but the surrounding area is essentially rural in character.
Suitability Information:	Net Cuiteble
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
1	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to
Availability ¹ :	the next stage of the site assessment process.
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 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 Suitability ³ :	The site can only be accessed through flood zones 2 and/or 3 which would require consideration in the next stage of the site assessment process. Alternatively there are other site promotions which could provide an alternative access, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s).
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA006
Site Address:	West of New Holding, Watling Street, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	2.69
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	81
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Agricultural land (grazing) on the north western edge of Craven Arms. The site consists of parts of two agricultural fields but excludes the farmstead of New Holding and its immediate curtilage. The site runs to the west of Watling Street between a small brook north of New Holding (north) and Oak Cottage/ Tanglewood Farm (south).
Surrounding Character:	Land to the east of the site is an allocated housing site CRAV003. To the north, west and south the land is rural in character. However, some agricultural buildings have begun to be used for more urban activities, such as a commercial 'play barn' (south).
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to
Availability ¹ :	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.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA007
Site Address:	Land North of Council Depot off Clun Road, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	14.44
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	433
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	This site lies to the west of Watling Street but is separated from this road by CRA015 and CRA016. It is an extensive area of open countryside comprising a number of agricultural fields which are some considerable distance from the built edge of the town. The site extends south to Clun Road where it forms part of the rural gateway to Craven Arms.
Surrounding Character:	The surrounding land is almost all in agricultural use with the exception of the highways depot in the south-east corner. It is rural in character and physically distinct from the settlement of Craven Arms.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
Availability ¹ :	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³ :	In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement. Whilst there are other site promotions within this area of separation, there remains uncertainty about the availability of adjacent site(s).
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA010
Site Address:	Land north of Long Lane, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	1.85
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	55
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site comprises agricultural land on the north western edge of Craven Arms to the north of Long Lane. The land is essentially rural in nature and there is extensive hedgerow and tree cover on the boundaries. This rurality typifies the marked change in landscape character over a short distance in Craven Arms: from the sharply defined urban edge of the settlement to the east of Watling Street to land in active agricultural use to the west.
Surrounding Character:	The site adjoins the Craven Arms gypsy site to the east. The remainder of the surrounding land is in active agricultural use. More widely, the Craven Arms Business Park lies to the south-east and the Shropshire Hills AONB boundary is less than 1km away to both the east and west.
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site
Achievability/Viability Information:	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.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA011
Site Address:	Land north west of Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	2.76
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	83
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	This almost square site is in active agricultural use. It lies just beyond the north western edge of Craven Arms, immediately north of the existing gypsy and traveller site. It is relatively remote from Craven Arms and has an isolated feel.
Surrounding Character:	Agricultural land on all sides but around half of the southern boundary adjoins an existing gypsy and traveller site.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to
Availability ¹ :	the next stage of the site assessment process.
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³ :	In isolation, the site is landlocked and does not appear to have a road frontage, but there is another site promotion which could provide an access to the site (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint).
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA012
Site Address:	Employment site off Shrewsbury Road, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	2.35
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	71
Type of Site:	Brownfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	site comprises a timber merchant and architectural salvage depot with extensive road frontage onto A49. Site is within the built form of Craven Arms
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is urban. The Shrewsbury to Hereford railway line forms the western boundary whilst the A49 forms the eastern boundary. Commercial premises to the north and south and residential properties on the other side of the A49 add to the built up character of the area.
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to
Availability ¹ :	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.

She Assessment - Shage 20	
Site Reference:	CRA013X
Site Address:	Car park of the Old Post Office, Shrewsbury Road
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	0.09
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	<5
Type of Site:	Brownfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	
Surrounding Character:	
Suitability Information:	
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
Availability ¹ :	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.
Conclusion: Size ² :	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 Suitability ³ :	As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA.
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA014
Site Address:	Land West of the Railway Line, North West of Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	8.47
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	254
Type of Site:	
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	This is a large field at some distance from the built form of Craven Arms. It is rural in character and in active agricultural use. The sense of isolation is increased by the Shrewsbury to Hereford railway line along the eastern boundary.
Surrounding Character:	All adjacent land is in agricultural use and is rural in character.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to
Availability ¹ :	the next stage of the site assessment process.
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³ :	In isolation, the site is landlocked and does not appear to have a road frontage, but there is another site promotion which could provide an access to the site (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint).
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA015
Site Address:	Land North of Clun Road and East of Watling Street, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	0.87
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	26
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Site on periphery of Craven Arms, west of Watling Street / the former path of Watling Street and close to its now realigned junction with the B4368 Clun Road. The site consists of part of an arable field. Land levels rise gently to the north and west.
Surrounding Character:	Site envelopes a pair of semi-detached dwellings to the immediate southwest. There are two further properties beyond a gap to the north, and a residential caravan and recently constructed 'affordable' house south of the main road.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
Availability ¹	
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³	
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA016
Site Address:	North of Clun Road, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	3.67
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	110
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Site comprises three fields in agricultural use (grazing) to the west of Watling Street. It has a frontage onto Clun Road.
Surrounding Character:	Predominantly rural and agricultural but it adjoins a 100% affordable housing "exceptions" scheme located to north east and there is housing to the south. The southwest corner of the site adjoins the highways depot.
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site
Achievability/Viability Information:	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 to
Availability ¹ :	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.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA017
Site Address:	Tanglewood Farm, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	1.57
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	47
Type of Site:	Mixed
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	Approx. 50%
General Description:	Site comprises two fields extending westwards from Watling Street. It includes Tanglewood Farm, which has two holiday cottages and a cattery as well as Mickey Millers Play Barn and a florist's , together with other agricultural buildings and a large area of hardstanding. Together these uses occupy approximately half the site area. The remainder of the site is in agricultural use.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding land is in agricultural use, with some agricultural storage buildings and hard standing to the west.
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site
Achievability/Viability Information:	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 to
Availability ¹ :	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.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA018
Site Address:	South of Halford, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	6.44
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	193
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	This is a large, irregularly shaped field along the eastern side of the River Onny, off Corvedale Road and outside the built area of Craven Arms. It is in agricultural use and much of the site area is within Flood Zone 3.
Surrounding Character:	Land to the north, east and west is in agricultural use and a wooded area of ox bow lakes associated with the adjacent River Onny comprises the part of the western boundary. The river runs between the site, the abattoir to the north-west and the remainder of Craven Arms.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Detential
(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.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	-
Site Reference:	CRA021
Site Address:	The Sidings west of Craven Arms Station, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	0.78
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	23
Type of Site:	Brownfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	This is a linear urban site within the Craven Arms development boundary. Approximately half the site area is occupied by a railway siding, the remainder is covered by trees and scrub.
Surrounding Character:	Essentially urban with residential and commercial uses as well as the Shrewsbury to Hereford railway line (to the west), although the north west corner of the site borders an agricultural field.
Suitability Information:	Not Cuitable
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan
	Review.
Availability ¹ :	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to
Conclusion: Size ² :	the next stage of the site assessment process.
Strategic Suitability ³ :	In isolation, the site is landlocked and does not appear to have a road frontage. The adjacent allocated site could provide an access to the site, subject to layout. It is not clear whether the rail sidings within the site are in active use or not, if they are then this would reduce the developable area and could have amenity implications. The site is narrow and tight against the railway line.
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA023
Site Address:	Lane East of Watling Street, North of Sibdon Fields, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	1.58
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	48
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site is rural in character, comprising a rectangular field to the west of Watling Street and beyond the built edge of Craven Arms.
Surrounding Character:	Rural in character, although a small exception site for housing is adjacent to part of the southern boundary and land on the other side of Watling Street is in residential use.
Suitability Information:	Net Comently Critekie but Fotom Detential
(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 :	
Summany	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached
Summary:	regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA024
Site Address:	Lane East of Watling Street, South of Tanglewood Farm, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	2.97
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	89
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	This site comprises a field to the west of Watling Street and south of Tanglewood Farm. It is in agricultural use and contains two ponds close to its boundary with Watling Street.
Surrounding Character:	The surrounding character is generally rural with the exception of the businesses associated with Tanglewood Farm (Mickey Miller's Play Barn, holiday cottages, florist's etc). The sites eastern boundary with Watling Street marks the change from the suburban edge of Craven Arms to open countryside.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Detential
(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.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA025
Site Address:	Lane East of Watling Street, North of Tanglewood Farm, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	1.60
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	48
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site is one of a series of fields running generally east-west on the west side of Watling Street, but outside the urban area of Craven Arms. It is in agricultural use but includes some buildings associated with an agricultural contractors business adjacent to the site and on the Watling Street frontage.
Surrounding Character:	Land to the east of the site is urban in nature, comprising allocated housing land (CRA003 and CRA009). To the north, west and south the land is rural in character. However, some agricultural buildings to the south have begun to be used for more urban activities, such as a commercial 'play barn'. Watling Street forms a clear boundary to the east between the built form of Craven Arms and the countryside within which this site is located.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
Availability ¹	
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³ :	
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA026
Site Address:	Land at 2 Oakfield, Clun Road, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	0.52
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	16
Type of Site:	Mixed
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	Approx. 50%
General Description:	The site consists of a dwelling, its curtilage and paddock land. The site is located to the south of Clun Road, to the South West of Craven Arms.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural/rural. A housing allocation is located to the north east of the site. The site is bounded by the railway line to the South. Clun Road to the North and West; and Roman Road to the East.
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 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.

Site Assessment - Stage 20	
Site Reference:	CRA027X
Site Address:	adjacent Brandlea adjoining Newton Lane, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	0.07
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	<5
Type of Site:	
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	
Surrounding Character:	
Suitability Information:	
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
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. 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 Suitability ³ :	
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

	Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA028	
Site Address:	Land at Halford, Corvdale Road, Craven Arms	
Settlement:	Craven Arms	
Site Size (Ha):	1.97	
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	59	
Type of Site:	Greenfield	
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A	
General Description:	A linear site located to the south of Corvedale Road. The site consists of the northern element of two agricultural fields.	
Surrounding Character:	Character to the east and south is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is employment/commercial. Character to the north is a mix of residential and agricultural.	
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential	
(from SLAA)		
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available	
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.	
Availability ¹ :		
Conclusion: Size ² :		
Strategic Suitability ³ :		
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.	

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA029
Site Address:	Garage Corvedale Rd, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	0.27
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	8
Type of Site:	Brownfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of a garage building, its forecourt and associated hardstanding; and a funeral services building and associated hardstanding.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is a mix of residential and commercial.
Suitability Information:	Currently Suitable
(from SLAA)	
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
Availability ¹ :	
Conclusion: Size ² :	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.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA030
Site Address:	Land at Newington Farm, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	8.47
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	254
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Linear series of agricultural fields running along Shrewsbury Road to the north of Craven Arms. The site is allocated for employment development.
Surrounding Character:	Character is predominantly agricultural to the north east and west. To the south character is primarily employment based, with pockets of residential and agricultural.
Suitability Information:	
(from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
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.

Sile Assessment - Slage 20	
Site Reference:	CRA031
Site Address:	Land west of A49, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	2.62
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	79
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Two agricultural fields located to the north of Craven Arms between the Railway Line and Shrewsbury Road. The site is allocated for employment development.
Surrounding Character:	Character is predominantly agricultural to the north east and west (land to east and west is allocated for employment development). To the south character is primarily employment based, with pockets of residential.
Suitability Information:	
(from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
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.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA032
Site Address:	Land north of Long Lane, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	3.44
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	103
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Triangular shaped site currently in use as an agricultural field. The site is bounded by Watling Street to the west; the railway line to the east and Long Lane to the south. The site is allocated for employment development.
Surrounding Character:	Character is predominantly agricultural to the north east and west (land to east is allocated for employment development). To the south character is primarily employment based, with pockets of residential.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
Availability ¹ :	
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³ :	
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	CRA033
Site Address:	West of Craven Arms Business Park, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	3.71
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	111
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of a rectangular agricultural field located to the east of Watling Street and the Craven Arms Business Park.
Surrounding Character:	Character to the south and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north is also predominantly agricultural although there is also a small gypsy and traveller site. Character to the west is predominantly commercial, consisting of the Craven Arms Business Park.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Detential
(from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site
	specific issues evident.
Achievability/Viability Information:	To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan
	Review.
1	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to
Availability ¹ :	the next stage of the site assessment process.
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³ :	
-	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites
Summary:	availability, size and/or suitability.

Sile Assessment - Stuge 20	
Site Reference:	CRA034X
Site Address:	rear of 10 Norton View
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	0.19
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	<5
Type of Site:	
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	
Surrounding Character:	
Suitability Information:	Nat 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 :	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 Suitability ³	
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Sile Assessille in - Sluge 20	
Site Reference:	CRA035X
Site Address:	Grasmere Clun Rd, Craven Arms
Settlement:	Craven Arms
Site Size (Ha):	0.10
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	<5
Type of Site:	
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	
Surrounding Character:	
Suitability Information:	
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information:	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
Availability	
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 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 Suitability ³	
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

Craven Arms Place Plan Area Stage 3 Detailed Site Review: Site Assessments

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	CRA001
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	
Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	2%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	9%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	91%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year	51/1
surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	
surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	
surface flood risk zone:	2%
Percentage of the site identified on the	0%
EA Historic Flood Map:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	0%
historic flood event:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	27%
detailed river network:	
All or part of the site within a Source	Νο
Protection Zone:	
Landscape Considerations:	High
(from the LVSS)	
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium-Low
(from the LVSS)	Medium-Low
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	Y.
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 Access Point is Not	
Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made	
So?	
So? Highway Comments - Could the	
	v
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Y
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged	
Off-Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	23
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	
Significant Constraints:	None
Significant constraints.	

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	EcIA required as potential for bats and nesting birds in the buildings. Small areas of the site are within Flood Zone 2 and perhaps 3.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	Mitigation for bats may be required if present.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Opening up the southern boundary to make the most of the access to the river would add value to either commercial or residential properties. Consider how this might fit into access along the water course.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Part of a larger SAMDev allocation. Site adjacent to the boundary , and within setting, of Craven Arms Conservation Area.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of Conservation Area)
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	A development that demonstrates high quality design would likely significantly enhance the setting of the CA.
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	There is a stand of trees adjacent to the sites south east corner these are an integral part of the riparian habitat corridor and should be retained and where possible enhances
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundaries
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through maintenance of a 15m buffer with adjoining woodland / habitat corridor and on site And through the inclusion of sustainable spaces for strategic tree planting alongside the Corvedale Road facing.

Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Part of a larger SAMDev allocation. Site adjacent to the boundary , and within setting, of Craven Arms Conservation Area.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of Conservation Area)
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	A development that demonstrates high quality design would likely significantly enhance the setting of the CA.
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 500 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment land for Craven Arms in the period to 2026. At the meeting of Craven Arms Town Council on 28th August 2018, Shropshire Council recommended that this strategy remained sufficiently robust to continue to meet the needs of the community of Craven Arms as part of the Local Plan review for the period 2016 to 2036 and the housing and employment guideline figures should be sustained over this revised plan period. Existing commitments and allocations in Craven Arms will fulfil the employment guideline figure and current housing commitments leave a residual requirement for land for 91 dwellings. Craven Arms Town Council have therefore resolved to continue to pursue this strategy and to accept the residual requirement for 91 dwellings as an allowance for further, unidentified (windfall) housing sites to come forward over the revised plan period to 2036. There is therefore, no intention to make any further housing or employment allocations in Craven Arms.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation?	No
Recommendation Reasoning	Remain as countryside It is not intended to make any further allocations within Craven Arms, over and above those allocated within the SAMDev Plan (2015). The focus will therefore be on the delivery of the currently allocated sites.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	CRA010
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	Yes
Agricultural Land Quality:	res
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	3%
surface flood risk zone:	5/0
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	10%
surface flood risk zone:	10/0
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	26%
surface flood risk zone:	20/8
Percentage of the site identified on the	0%
EA Historic Flood Map:	070
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	2%
historic flood event:	۷/۵
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	13%
detailed river network:	13/0
All or part of the site within a Source	Νο
Protection Zone:	NO
Landscape Considerations:	Modium
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	Madium
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	γ
Highway Network?	T
Highway Comments - If No Direct	
Access, Can One Reasonably Be	
Achieved? And How?	
Highway Commonte Existing Highway	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	Ν
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	N
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing	
Highway at Access Point is Not	Y. Long La improvements needed - widening and appropriate pedestrian / cyclist provision.
Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made	r. Long La improvements needed - widening and appropriate pedestrian / cyclist provision.
So?	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Ν
Works?	
Highugu Commente Are Environd	V Contribution to improvements to western and of long to and Westing St. (Long to improve
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged	Y. Contribution to improvements to western end of Long La and Watling St / Long La junction
Off-Site Works Achievable?	needed.
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	12
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	13
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	None
Significant Constraints:	

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	EcIA would be required of hedgerows and boundary trees to check for birds and bats. Also small water course on northern boundary
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	Retain wide root protection zone of mature boundary trees. Create wide buffer to small water course on northern boundary and consider making this a feature to combine wide SUDS requirement
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Create biodiverse SUDS feature of the water course to the north.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site c.60m E of Watling Street South Roman road (HER PRN 00108), c.75m S of the Craven Arms Marching Camp C (HER PRN 02041) and c. 105m W of the Craven Arms Marching Camp B (HER PRN 00620), both of which comprise important Roman military sites. Site is therefore considered to have archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on CA; archaeological field evaluation [geophysical survey and trial trenching]). NB Desk Based Assessment by Castlering Archaeology prepared in 2013.
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	Significant mature hedgerow oak at roadside in the SW corner. The hedgerows on the south and north field margins are likely to be important hedgerows and should be retained in as complete a state as possible, access is off a single track lane therefore there is likely to be pressure to remove hedgerows to widen the lane and provide access splays. The shelter belt at the eastern side of the site of the site alongside the gypsy site is semi-mature and has potential to grown taller and wider.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundaries. The mature roadside oak should be included in a space where development does not cause proximity issues. Translocation of existing mature hedgerows to the new site boundary and or compensatory native species hedgerow planting.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining woodland / habitat corridor and on site mature trees, and through the inclusion of sustainable spaces for strategic tree planting alongside the site margins. Translocation of existing mature hedgerows to the new site boundary and or compensatory native species hedgerow planting.

Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Site c.60m E of Watling Street South Roman road (HER PRN 00108), c.75m S of the Craven Arms Marching Camp C (HER PRN 02041) and c. 105m W of the Craven Arms Marching Camp B (HER PRN 00620), both of which comprise important Roman military sites. Site is therefore considered to have archaeological potential.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on CA; archaeological field evaluation [geophysical survey and trial trenching]). NB Desk Based Assessment by Castlering Archaeology prepared in 2013.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Poor
Strategic Considerations:	The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 500 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment land for Craven Arms in the period to 2026. At the meeting of Craven Arms Town Council on 28th August 2018, Shropshire Council recommended that this strategy remained sufficiently robust to continue to meet the needs of the community of Craven Arms as part of the Local Plan review for the period 2016 to 2036 and the housing and employment guideline figures should be sustained over this revised plan period. Existing commitments and allocations in Craven Arms will fulfil the employment guideline figure and current housing commitments leave a residual requirement for land for 91 dwellings. Craven Arms Town Council have therefore resolved to continue to pursue this strategy and to accept the residual requirement for 91 dwellings as an allowance for further, unidentified (windfall) housing sites to come forward over the revised plan period to 2036. There is therefore, no intention to make any further housing or employment allocations in Craven Arms.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation?	No
Recommendation	Remain as countryside
Reasoning	It is not intended to make any further allocations within Craven Arms, over and above those allocated within the SAMDev Plan (2015). The focus will therefore be on the delivery of the currently allocated sites.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Reference: CRADIS Coll Authority Reference Areo? No Mineral Safeguarding Areo? No Mineral Safeguarding Areo? No Mineral Safeguarding Areo? No Magnetural Index Coll Science State OK Percentage of site in Fload Zone 2: OK Percentage of site in Fload Zone 2: OK Percentage of the site in the 30 year OK surface fload risk zone: OK Percentage of the site in the 100 year OK Surface fload risk zone: OK Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year OK Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year OK Percentage of the site within 20m of a OK Percentage of the site within 20m of a OK Percentage of the site within 20m of a OK Percentage of the site within Source No Protection Zone: No Londscape Considerations: Medium Visual impact Considerations: Medium Highway Comments - UNSD Medium Highway Consents - Disct Access to a Y Highway Comments - No Y <t< th=""><th>Site Assessment - Stage 3</th><th></th></t<>	Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Mineral Safeguarding Area? No Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 3: O% Percentage of site in Fload Zone 2: O% Percentage of site in The 30 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 30 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site inthe 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of a historic fload wap: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed view network: All or part of the site within 20m of a for the site within 20m of a foresterion 20% (from the VSS) (from the LVSS) Kuedium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Castsing Highway Sutable for Troff. Associated with the Perelogued with the Surface Sond the Site Not Surface Sond the Site Not Surface Sond the Site Not Surface Sond the Access Point? Highway Comments - Cast Sond Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? (13	Site Reference:	CRA015
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Yes Agricultural Lond Quality: 0% Percentage of Site in Flood Zone 2: 0% Percentage of the Site in the 30 year 0% 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: 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of an 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of an 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a 0% If on ant of the site within 20m of a 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a 0% If on ant of the si	Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 3: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 2: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 2: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic fload event: Percentage for the site within 20m of an historic fload event: Percentage for 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 Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If xisting Highway Comments - Cauld the Percelog and the Access Point? Highway Comments - Cauld the Percelog and the Xand Public Sord Highway Comments - Cauld the Percelog and Source Protection Zone: No Source Sour	Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Agricultural Lond Quality: Yes Percentage of site in Fload Zone 3: 0% Percentage of site in Fload Zone 1: 100% Percentage of the site in the 30 year 0% surface fload risk zone: 0% Percentage of the site in the 30 year 0% surface fload risk zone: 0% Percentage of the site in the 30 year 0% Percentage of the site in the 100 year 0% Percentage of the site inthe 100 year 0% Percentage of the site within 200 of an historic fload event: 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of an detailed river network: 0% All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: 0% All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: 0% Ifram the LVSS) Medium Wighway Comments - Direct Access to highway Network? Y Highway Comments - Gife Associated with the Profile Associated with the Provelopment of the Access Point Profile Associate	Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: 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 inthe 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site inthe 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site inthe 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site inthe 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: 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: Iondscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved 2 And How? Highway Comments - Listing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development of the Xiess Point is Not Suitable, Con It Reasonably be Made So ² 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 Achievable? Highway Convenience Store & Public		Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: 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 inthe 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site inthe 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site inthe 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site inthe 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: 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: Iondscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved 2 And How? Highway Comments - Listing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development of the Xiess Point is Not Suitable, Con It Reasonably be Made So ² 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 Achievable? Highway Convenience Store & Public	Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Fload Zone 1: 100% Percentage of the site in the 30 year 0% Percentage of the site in the 100 year 0% Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year 0% Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year 0% Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year 0% Percentage of the site intel and the 1,000 year 0% Percentage of the site intel and the 1,000 year 0% Percentage of the site intel and the 1,000 year 0% Percentage of the site intel and the 1,000 year 0% Percentage of the site intel and the 1,000 year 0% Percentage of the site intel 2,000 year 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of an 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a 0% Percentage of the site within a Source No Protection Zone: No Landscape Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Visual Impact Considerations: Medium Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Actieved? And Haw? Y Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing <t< td=""><td></td><td></td></t<>		
Percentage of the site in the 30 year 0% surface flood risk zone: 0% Percentage of the site in the 100 year 0% Percentage of the site in the 1000 year 0% Percentage of the site in the 1000 year 0% Percentage of the site in the 1000 year 0% Percentage of the site identified on the 0% EA Historic Flood rest zone: 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of an 0% Instantic flood event: 0% Percentage of the site within 30m of a 0% detailed river network: 0% All or part of the site within a Source No Protection Zone: No Landscape Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Y Highway Retwork? Y Highway Comments - Lif Susting Highway Comments - Lif Susting Highway Comments - Lif Susting Highway Y Sultable for Traffic Associated with the Y Development at the Access Point is Not Sultable, Can It Reasonably be Made Sultable, Can It Reasonably be Made So ²		100%
surface flood risk zone: 0% Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: 0% Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: 0% Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: 0% Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: 0% All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: No Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Y Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - Only Existing Highway Comments - Only Existing Highway Comments - Only Existing Highway Comments - Could the Development of Cucr Without Off-Site Works? Y Highway Comments - Could the Development Cucr Without Off-Site Works? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? 13		201
Percentage of the site in the 100 year 0% surface fload risk zone: 0% Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year 0% surface fload risk zone: 0% Percentage of the site identified on the 0% EA Historic Fload Map: 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of an 0% historic fload event: 0% Percentage of the site within 20m of a 0% All or part of the site within a Source 0% Protection Zone: No Landscape Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Visual Impact Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achievel? And How? Y Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing Y Highway Comments - Could the Y Development at the Access Point ? Y Highway Comments - Could the Y Development at Cour Without Off-Site Y		0%
Surface Jood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Fload Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic fload 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 (from the LVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Keisting Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point is Not Suitable for Traffic Associated with of Highway Comments - Lifexisting Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Sconments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Sconments - Kate Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Sconments - Kate Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? 13		201
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) Wedium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Verwork? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - If Sisting Highway Comments - If Sisting Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point ? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Sisting Highway Comments - Sisting Highway Suitable Can te Reasonably be Mode So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Caccur Withou Off-Site Warks? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Sconder Store & Public		0%
Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Fload Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic fload 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 Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Verwork? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - Lifexisting Highway Comments - Lifexisting Highway Comments - Could the Development Coccur Without Off-Site V Warks? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Scomments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Scomments - Store & Public	Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	201
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 Construct Access Point: Highway Comments - Lif Existing Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Sourcessibility Rating (Out Off 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	surface flood risk zone:	0%
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 20m. No Landscape Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Visual Impact Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Y Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Troffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Y Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Suitable for Troffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Y Highway Comments - Lift Suitage Highway Comments - Lift Suitage Highway to Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Y Vorks? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Y Highway Saments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? 13		201
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) Visual Network? Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - Lowed the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Off 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public		0%
historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Insue Impact Constant Impact Con		
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: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Visual Impact Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Access, Can One Reasonably Be Access, Can One Reasonably Be Accieved? And How? Y Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Y Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achieveable? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achieveable? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achieveable? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achieveable? Y 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public 13		0%
detailed river network: 0% All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: No Landscape Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Visual Impact Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Y Highway Comments - If Sociated with the Y Development at the Access Point? Y Highway Comments - If Existing Y Highway Comments - If Existing Y Development at the Access Point? Y Highway Comments - If Existing Y Highway Comments - Could the Y Development Occur Without Off-Site Y Works? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged 13	-	
All or part of the site within a Source No Protection Zone: No Landscape Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Visual Impact Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Y Highway Comments - Existing Highway Y Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Y Development at the Access Point? Y Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing Y Highway Comments - If Existing Y Highway Comments - If Existing Y Highway Comments - Guild the Y Development Occur Without Off-Site Y Works? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Off 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public 13		0%
Protection Zone: NO Landscape Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Visual Impact Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Acchieved? And How? Y Highway Comments - Existing Highway Y Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Y Development at the Access Point? Y Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing Y Development at the Access Point ? Y Highway Comments - Could the Y Development Occur Without Off-Site Y Works? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Off 24) 24) (Based on Primary School, GP 13		
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing 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		No
Image: Instant Medium (from the LVSS) Medium Visual Impact Considerations: Medium (from the LVSS) Y Highway Comments - Direct Access to Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Y Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Y Development at the Access Point? Y Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made Y So? Y Highway Comments - Could the Y Development Occur Without Off-Site Y Works? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP 13		
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing 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		Medium
Ifrom the LVSS) Medium Highway Comments - Direct Access to Y Highway Network? Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? Achieved? And How? Y Highway Comments - Existing Highway Y Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Y Development at the Access Point? Y Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing Y Highway Comments - Could the So? Development Occur Without Off-Site Y Works? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP 13		
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing Highway taccess 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		Medium
Highway Network? Y Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway Comments - If Existing Highway to 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		
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		Y
Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?YHighway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?YHighway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?YHighway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?YHighway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public13		
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 Sconselity Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public		
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? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	· · ·	
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? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public		
Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public		
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public		Y
Highway at Access Point is NotSuitable, Can It Reasonably be MadeSo?Highway Comments - Could theDevelopment Occur Without Off-SiteWorks?Highway Comments - Are EnvisagedOff-Site Works Achievable?Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of24) (Based on Primary School, GPSurgery, Convenience Store & Public	Development at the Access Point?	
Highway at Access Point is NotSuitable, Can It Reasonably be MadeSo?Highway Comments - Could theDevelopment Occur Without Off-SiteWorks?Highway Comments - Are EnvisagedOff-Site Works Achievable?Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of24) (Based on Primary School, GPSurgery, Convenience Store & Public	Highway Comments - If Existing	
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		
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		
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		
Development Occur Without Off-Site Y Works? Y Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public 13		
Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public		v
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public		
Off-Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public		
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	Highway Comments - Are Envisaged	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	Off-Site Works Achievable?	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	Highways Accessibility Datian (Out of	
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public		
		13
Transport Service):		
	Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	Ecoloav Comments	
Significant Constraints: None		None
	e.gjieant constraintsi	

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	EcIA would be required of hedgerows, boundary trees to check for birds and bats and the pond 160m to the south. There is a record of Great Crested Newt to the south (somewhere between 30 and 170m away) which is likely to be associated with the pond to the south. There are two pools just over 200m to the north. EcIA is also required for these ponds.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	Retain wide root protection zone of mature boundary trees. Mitigation for Great Crested Newts may be required if they are found.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Create link to public footpath in northern corner
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site adjacent to Watling Street South Roman road (HER PRN 00108). Cropmarks of a possible linear trackway (HER PRN 30662) are present on the site and may be associated with a Roman enclosure (HER PRN 02045) on the east side of the Roman road. Site therefore has known archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	The site is clearly visible from the surrounding countryside and AONB but apart from hedgerows on the site margins is screened by no existing mature trees.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Landscape impact assessment required to inform a sustainable site layout that includes appropriate space for strategic tree planting that in the long-term will mature and integrate the site into the landscape.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through protecting restoring or enhancing the existing hedgerows / habitat corridors and the inclusion of sustainable spaces for strategic tree planting alongside the site margins.

Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Site adjacent to Watling Street South Roman road (HER PRN 00108). Cropmarks of a possible linear trackway (HER PRN 30662) are present on the site and may be associated with a Roman enclosure (HER PRN 02045) on the east side of the Roman road. Site therefore has known archaeological potential.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Poor
Strategic Considerations:	The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 500 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment land for Craven Arms in the period to 2026. At the meeting of Craven Arms Town Council on 28th August 2018, Shropshire Council recommended that this strategy remained sufficiently robust to continue to meet the needs of the community of Craven Arms as part of the Local Plan review for the period 2016 to 2036 and the housing and employment guideline figures should be sustained over this revised plan period. Existing commitments and allocations in Craven Arms will fulfil the employment guideline figure and current housing commitments leave a residual requirement for land for 91 dwellings. Craven Arms Town Council have therefore resolved to continue to pursue this strategy and to accept the residual requirement for 91 dwellings as an allowance for further, unidentified (windfall) housing sites to come forward over the revised plan period to 2036. There is therefore, no intention to make any further housing or employment allocations in Craven Arms.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation?	No
Recommendation	Remain as countryside
Reasoning	It is not intended to make any further allocations within Craven Arms, over and above those allocated within the SAMDev Plan (2015). The focus will therefore be on the delivery of the currently allocated sites.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	CRA018
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	Yes
Agricultural Land Quality:	103
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	59%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	61%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	39%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year	4%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	11%
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	
surface flood risk zone:	29%
Percentage of the site identified on the	
EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	
historic flood event:	1%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	
detailed river network:	14%
All or part of the site within a Source	
Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	Ligh and Madium
(from the LVSS)	High and Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium-Low and Medium
(from the LVSS)	
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	γ
Highway Network?	·
Highway Comments - If No Direct	
Access, Can One Reasonably Be	
Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Ν
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing	
Highway at Access Point is Not	
Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made	Y. Speed limit will need to be extended on B4368 link to CRA028
So?	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments Are Fridered	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged	
Off-Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	21
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	
Transport Service):	
	Presence of habitats of principle importance (grassland most likely in this case) to be
Ecology Comments	determined by an EcIA including a detailed National Vegetation Classification level survey. If
Significant Constraints:	species-rich priority grassland is present avoidance unlikely to be possible and therefore
	application could be refused under MD12. Within Env. Network and so CS17 applies. Housing
	would reduce/damage the corridor.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	 EcIA required. Surveys for habitats (in particular grassland). Survey would need to cover the north west corner of the site in particular as this banked area is most likely to contain interest. Several notable veteran trees are recorded in the field and on the boundaries. Several pools (perhaps oxbow pools) are found just to the west of the site. The EcIA would also need to check these for protected species such as Great Crested Newt, Otter, reptiles and rare plants. The 4 sections of well-used footpath through this field, which in places, has a very natural look, shows this field has significant value as accessible natural greenspace. Loss of this to the local community could have significant health impacts.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	If the grassland in the site is of biodiversity interest, in part or for the majority of the site, it may be difficult if not impossible to mitigate the loss of environmental network on site. The woodland and pools to the west and the river to the south would all require significant buffers to retain their function as both wildlife corridor and core habitat. The veteran trees should all be retained with large buffers to protect their root zones.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	The corridor and habitats to the south and west in particular should be considered for enhancement or retention depending on the value of existing habitats present.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	S end of site falls within Newtown Conservation Area. Earthwork remains of a possible trackway (HER PRN 02018), ridge and furrow (HER PRN 31287) and a circular mound (HER PRN 31401) present on site and it therefore has known archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on CA and it setting, archaeological field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	Riparian woodland abuts the sites west and south-west boundaries and two blocks of mature trees stand alongside the Corvedale Road boundary. Mature hedgerow exist around the remaining site boundaries. Sections of the site prone to flooding. The River Onny riparian woodland in particular is part of an important habitat corridor that would be bracketed by housing if this site is developed. Any development at this site should ensure the its protection, conservation and enhancement of this feature along its whole length.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundaries. The mature roadside oak should be included in a space where development does not cause proximity issues. Access is off a single track lane therefore there is likely to be pressure to remove hedgerows to widen the lane and provide access splays.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining woodland / habitat corridor and on site mature trees, and through the inclusion of sustainable spaces for strategic tree planting alongside the site margins. Translocation of existing mature hedgerows to the new site boundary and or compensatory native species hedgerow planting.

Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	S end of site falls within Newtown Conservation Area. Earthwork remains of a possible trackway (HER PRN 02018), ridge and furrow (HER PRN 31287) and a circular mound (HER PRN 31401) present on site and it therefore has known archaeological interest.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on CA and it setting, archaeological field evaluation).
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Fair
Strategic Considerations:	The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 500 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment land for Craven Arms in the period to 2026. At the meeting of Craven Arms Town Council on 28th August 2018, Shropshire Council recommended that this strategy remained sufficiently robust to continue to meet the needs of the community of Craven Arms as part of the Local Plan review for the period 2016 to 2036 and the housing and employment guideline figures should be sustained over this revised plan period. Existing commitments and allocations in Craven Arms will fulfil the employment guideline figure and current housing commitments leave a residual requirement for land for 91 dwellings. Craven Arms Town Council have therefore resolved to continue to pursue this strategy and to accept the residual requirement for 91 dwellings as an allowance for further, unidentified (windfall) housing sites to come forward over the revised plan period to 2036. There is therefore, no intention to make any further housing or employment allocations in Craven Arms.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation?	No
Recommendation	Remain as countryside
Reasoning	It is not intended to make any further allocations within Craven Arms, over and above those allocated within the SAMDev Plan (2015). The focus will therefore be on the delivery of the currently allocated sites.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	CRA023
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	No.
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:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	00/
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	20/
surface flood risk zone:	3%
Percentage of the site identified on the	00/
EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	20/
historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	
detailed river network:	11%
All or part of the site within a Source	
Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	
, (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Ŷ
Highway Comments - If No Direct	
Access, Can One Reasonably Be	
Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Ν
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing	
Highway at Access Point is Not	Y. Watling Street improvements needed - widening and appropriate pedestrian / cyclist
Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made	provision.
So?	provision.
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	
	12
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	
Transport Service):	<u> </u>
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	Presence of core habitat of environmental network (grassland most likely in this case) to be determined by an EcIA including a detailed National Vegetation Classification level survey. If species-rich priority grassland is present avoidance unlikely to be possible and therefore application could be refused under MD12. Within Env. Network and so CS17 applies. A tiny portion of the site is within the Environment Network as the buffer of the water course to the
	north extends into this field. Housing would reduce/damage the corridor. If a significant population of Great Crested Newts are found in the pools adjacent, the area of mitigation land required may significantly reduce the area available for development

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	EcIA required for the grassland and for the pools in the field to the north.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	If the grassland in the site is of biodiversity interest, in part or for the majority of the site, it may be difficult if not impossible to mitigate the loss of environmental network (core area) on site in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Mitigation for Great Crested Newts may be required if they are found in the pools to the north
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Green space could be placed on the northern boundary, closest to the pools, to make the most of the Environmental corridor in this area and into the field to the north (Ref CRA024)
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site adjacent to Watling Street South Roman road (HER PRN 00108) and c.60m N of Roman enclosure (HER PRN 02045) on the east side of the Roman road. Site therefore has some archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	The site is clearly visible from the surrounding countryside and AONB but apart from hedgerows (Probably important hedgerows)on the site margins it is screened by no existing mature trees.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Landscape impact assessment required to inform a sustainable site layout that includes appropriate space for strategic tree planting that in the long-term will mature and integrate the site into the landscape.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through protecting restoring or enhancing the existing hedgerows / habitat corridors and the inclusion of sustainable spaces for strategic tree planting alongside the site margins.

Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Site adjacent to Watling Street South Roman road (HER PRN 00108) and c.60m N of Roman enclosure (HER PRN 02045) on the east side of the Roman road. Site therefore has some archaeological potential.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Poor
Strategic Considerations:	The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 500 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment land for Craven Arms in the period to 2026. At the meeting of Craven Arms Town Council on 28th August 2018, Shropshire Council recommended that this strategy remained sufficiently robust to continue to meet the needs of the community of Craven Arms as part of the Local Plan review for the period 2016 to 2036 and the housing and employment guideline figures should be sustained over this revised plan period. Existing commitments and allocations in Craven Arms will fulfil the employment guideline figure and current housing commitments leave a residual requirement for land for 91 dwellings. Craven Arms Town Council have therefore resolved to continue to pursue this strategy and to accept the residual requirement for 91 dwellings as an allowance for further, unidentified (windfall) housing sites to come forward over the revised plan period to 2036. There is therefore, no intention to make any further housing or employment allocations in Craven Arms.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation?	No
Recommendation	Remain as countryside
Reasoning	It is not intended to make any further allocations within Craven Arms, over and above those allocated within the SAMDev Plan (2015). The focus will therefore be on the delivery of the currently allocated sites.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	CRA024
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	Vee
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	5%
surface flood risk zone:	570
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	60/
surface flood risk zone:	6%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	1.20/
surface flood risk zone:	12%
Percentage of the site identified on the	00/
EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	20/
historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	
detailed river network:	36%
All or part of the site within a Source	
Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Ŷ
Highway Comments - If No Direct	
Access, Can One Reasonably Be	
Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Ν
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing	
Highway at Access Point is Not	Y. Watling Street improvements needed - widening and appropriate pedestrian / cyclist
Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made	provision.
So?	provision.
Sor Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged	
Off-Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Dating (Out of	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	12
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	
Transport Service):	
	Presence of core habitat of environmental network along water course and a buffer to this. In
	addition the grassland may also be of core habitat status. This needs an EcIA including a
	detailed National Vegetation Classification level survey. If species-rich priority grassland is
Ecology Comments	present, avoidance measure are unlikely to be possible and therefore application could be
Significant Constraints:	refused under MD12. Within Env. Network and so CS17 applies. Housing would
significant constraints.	reduce/damage the corridor. If a significant population of Great Crested Newts are found in
	the pools the area of mitigation land required may significantly reduce the area available for
	development

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	EcIA required for the grassland and for the pools in the field. If neither are of interest or hold protected species then some areas of the field could support some development. Hedgerows are core habitat in the Environmental Network and should be retained or replacements put in place.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	A significant buffer of the water course and pools would be needed. If newts are present there is unlikely to be the space required on this plot to provide suitable mitigation.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	The water course and the pools, if buffered well, could form an attractive feature for sensitive development at this site.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site adjacent to Watling Street South Roman road (HER PRN 00108) and c.100m N of Roman enclosure (HER PRN 02045) on the east side of the Roman road. Site therefore has some archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	A stream passes through the site passing west to east, this may be seasonal but can not be ignored and the drainage team should be invited to comment.
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	The site is clearly visible from the surrounding countryside and AONB but apart from hedgerows (Probably important hedgerows)on the site margins it is screened by only a few existing mature trees. Access is off a single track lane therefore there is likely to be pressure to remove hedgerows to widen the lane and provide access splays.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Landscape impact assessment required to inform a sustainable site layout that includes appropriate space for strategic tree planting that in the long-term will mature and integrate the site into the landscape. Translocation of existing mature roadside hedgerow to the new site boundary and or compensatory native species hedgerow planting. Retain open water course and buffer / enhance this wildlife corridor.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through protecting restoring or enhancing the existing hedgerows / habitat corridors and the inclusion of sustainable spaces for strategic tree planting alongside the site margins and within the site.

Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Site adjacent to Watling Street South Roman road (HER PRN 00108) and c.100m N of Roman enclosure (HER PRN 02045) on the east side of the Roman road. Site therefore has some archaeological potential.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Poor
Strategic Considerations:	The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 500 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment land for Craven Arms in the period to 2026. At the meeting of Craven Arms Town Council on 28th August 2018, Shropshire Council recommended that this strategy remained sufficiently robust to continue to meet the needs of the community of Craven Arms as part of the Local Plan review for the period 2016 to 2036 and the housing and employment guideline figures should be sustained over this revised plan period. Existing commitments and allocations in Craven Arms will fulfil the employment guideline figure and current housing commitments leave a residual requirement for land for 91 dwellings. Craven Arms Town Council have therefore resolved to continue to pursue this strategy and to accept the residual requirement for 91 dwellings as an allowance for further, unidentified (windfall) housing sites to come forward over the revised plan period to 2036. There is therefore, no intention to make any further housing or employment allocations in Craven Arms.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation?	No
Recommendation	Remain as countryside
Reasoning	It is not intended to make any further allocations within Craven Arms, over and above those allocated within the SAMDev Plan (2015). The focus will therefore be on the delivery of the currently allocated sites.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	CRA025
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
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	201
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	201
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	201
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the	201
EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	201
historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	201
detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source	
Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct	
Access, Can One Reasonably Be	
Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Y
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing	
Highway at Access Point is Not	Y. Watling Street improvements needed - widening and appropriate pedestrian / cyclist
Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made	provision.
So?	μισνισιοπ.
Sor Highway Comments - Could the	
	Υ
Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	T
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged	
Off-Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Pating (Out Of	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	12
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	
Significant Constraints:	None

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	An EcIA should be carried out on the buildings on site to determine their value for bats and birds. Hedgerows are core habitat in the Environmental Network and should be retained or replacements put in place.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	Bird and bat mitigation may be required depending on survey results.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Hedge to the west could be enhanced to form a small band of woodland which would complement the good hedgerow along the western boundary of the field to the north.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site adjacent to Watling Street South Roman road (HER PRN 00108). It is also situated c.320m N of Roman enclosure (HER PRN 02045) and c.375m west of a second Roman enclosure (HER PRN 02046), both of which are located on the east side of the Roman road. There site is therefore considered to have some archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	Mature possibly important hedgerows along the south / east / west and part of the north boundary these are integral to the areas character and will be of significance as habitat corridors'. The site is serviced by a single track road, it is therefore likely that a development of any scale will require significant access improvements and pressure to remove sections or even large lengths of roadside of hedgerows.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Landscape impact assessment required to inform a sustainable site layout that includes appropriate space for strategic tree planting that in the long-term will mature and integrate the site into the landscape. Translocation of existing mature roadside hedgerow to the new site boundary and or compensatory native species hedgerow planting to compensate for any losses / visibility splays' etc. Existing hedgerows to be sustainably integrated into the development.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through protecting restoring or enhancing the existing hedgerows / habitat corridors and the inclusion of sustainable spaces for strategic tree planting alongside the site margins and within the site.

Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Site adjacent to Watling Street South Roman road (HER PRN 00108). It is also situated c.320m N of Roman enclosure (HER PRN 02045) and c.375m west of a second Roman enclosure (HER PRN 02046), both of which are located on the east side of the Roman road. There site is therefore considered to have some archaeological potential.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Poor
Strategic Considerations:	The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 500 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment land for Craven Arms in the period to 2026. At the meeting of Craven Arms Town Council on 28th August 2018, Shropshire Council recommended that this strategy remained sufficiently robust to continue to meet the needs of the community of Craven Arms as part of the Local Plan review for the period 2016 to 2036 and the housing and employment guideline figures should be sustained over this revised plan period. Existing commitments and allocations in Craven Arms will fulfil the employment guideline figure and current housing commitments leave a residual requirement for land for 91 dwellings. Craven Arms Town Council have therefore resolved to continue to pursue this strategy and to accept the residual requirement for 91 dwellings as an allowance for further, unidentified (windfall) housing sites to come forward over the revised plan period to 2036. There is therefore, no intention to make any further housing or employment allocations in Craven Arms.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation?	Νο
Recommendation	Remain as countryside
Reasoning	It is not intended to make any further allocations within Craven Arms, over and above those allocated within the SAMDev Plan (2015). The focus will therefore be on the delivery of the currently allocated sites.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	CRA026
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	Yes
Agricultural Land Quality:	165
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	3%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	5%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	20%
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:	30%
All or part of the site within a Source	
Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium and Medium-High
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium and Medium-High
(from the LVSS)	
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	Y
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	Ν
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing	
Highway at Access Point is Not	
Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made	Y. Extent of existing speed limit on B4368 needs to be extended.
So?	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments Are Environment	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged	
Off-Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	13
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	15
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	
Significant Constraints:	None

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	Environment Network runs along the railway line to the south and encroaches onto the site as a buffer of the water course along the eastern boundary. Development should not encroach into the network. Significant trees on site and in the boundaries should be retained and also surveyed for bats and birds. A pond is present to the south east of the site over the railway line and a great crested newt has been recorded either on this site or just to the north.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	An EcIA would be required for the pond to the south east and if newts are present the potential for other ponds nearby should be carefully examined. Damp areas in a nearby pasture associated with the stream may provide temporary breeding pools.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	The environmental network to the east of the site and the southern border could be enhanced.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	There are at least three mature trees on the site boundary these help provide maturity to the area and to screen the site from a distance, these trees merit retention and the constraints associated with them should be considered as part of any development proposal.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundaries .
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through protecting restoring or enhancing the existing hedgerows / habitat corridors and the inclusion of sustainable spaces for strategic tree planting alongside the site margins.

Public Protection Comments	N/A
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	N/A
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Poor
Strategic Considerations:	The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 500 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment land for Craven Arms in the period to 2026. At the meeting of Craven Arms Town Council on 28th August 2018, Shropshire Council recommended that this strategy remained sufficiently robust to continue to meet the needs of the community of Craven Arms as part of the Local Plan review for the period 2016 to 2036 and the housing and employment guideline figures should be sustained over this revised plan period. Existing commitments and allocations in Craven Arms will fulfil the employment guideline figure and current housing commitments leave a residual requirement for land for 91 dwellings. Craven Arms Town Council have therefore resolved to continue to pursue this strategy and to accept the residual requirement for 91 dwellings as an allowance for further, unidentified (windfall) housing sites to come forward over the revised plan period to 2036. There is therefore, no intention to make any further housing or employment allocations in Craven Arms.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation?	No
Recommendation	Remain as countryside
Reasoning	It is not intended to make any further allocations within Craven Arms, over and above those allocated within the SAMDev Plan (2015). The focus will therefore be on the delivery of the currently allocated sites.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	CRA028
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	Vee
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:	076
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	0%
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	3%
surface flood risk zone:	570
Percentage of the site identified on the	0%
EA Historic Flood Map:	076
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	0%
historic flood event:	076
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	0%
detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source	No
Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	High and Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium-Low and Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	V
Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct	
Access, Can One Reasonably Be	
Achieved? And How?	
Listury Comments Evistics Listury	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	N
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Ν
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing	
Highway at Access Point is Not	V. Speed limit will need to be extended on D42CO link to CD4040
Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made	Y. Speed limit will need to be extended on B4368 link to CRA018
So?	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments Are Environment	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged	
Off-Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	21
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	21
Transport Service):	
	Dresence of habitate of principle importance (greesland most likely in this case) in the super-
	Presence of habitats of principle importance (grassland most likely in this case) in the western
Factory Comments	section to be determined by an EcIA including a detailed National Vegetation Classification
Ecology Comments	level survey. If species-rich priority grassland is present avoidance measures may reduce the
Significant Constraints:	area of the site available to the point where the site is not viable. Therefore application could
	be refused under MD12. Within Env. Network and so CS17 applies. Housing would
	reduce/damage the corridor.
	1

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	Grassland to the west may be core habitat if species-rich grassland found. EcIA would be required of small woodland block and the old barn to check for protected species. In particular nesting birds and bats. Two rights of way cut through the site.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	If mitigation of the grassland and woodland is required the loss of area might constrain development to the eastern area. The loss of hedgerow would require mitigation on site. Greenspace could be focussed on the western portion of the development
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Earthwork remains of a possible trackway (HER PRN 02018) and ridge and furrow (HER PRN 31287) present on site and it therefore has known archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological field evaluation [geophysical survey and trial trenching]). NB Desk Based Assessment by Castlering Archaeology prepared in 2013.
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	Block of mature woodland on Corvedale Road boundary and roadside and field hedgerows. Site open to view from surrounding countryside and the AONB with little mature screening. Part of the site is within the AONB.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundaries . The mature hedgerows and woodland block need to be integrated sustainably into any new development.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through protecting restoring or enhancing the existing trees hedgerows / habitat corridors and the inclusion of sustainable spaces for strategic tree planting alongside the site margins and within the site.

Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Earthwork remains of a possible trackway (HER PRN 02018) and ridge and furrow (HER PRN 31287) present on site and it therefore has known archaeological interest.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological field evaluation [geophysical survey and trial trenching]). NB Desk Based Assessment by Castlering Archaeology prepared in 2013.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Fair
Strategic Considerations:	The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 500 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment land for Craven Arms in the period to 2026. At the meeting of Craven Arms Town Council on 28th August 2018, Shropshire Council recommended that this strategy remained sufficiently robust to continue to meet the needs of the community of Craven Arms as part of the Local Plan review for the period 2016 to 2036 and the housing and employment guideline figures should be sustained over this revised plan period. Existing commitments and allocations in Craven Arms will fulfil the employment guideline figure and current housing commitments leave a residual requirement for land for 91 dwellings. Craven Arms Town Council have therefore resolved to continue to pursue this strategy and to accept the residual requirement for 91 dwellings as an allowance for further, unidentified (windfall) housing sites to come forward over the revised plan period to 2036. There is therefore, no intention to make any further housing or employment allocations in Craven Arms.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation?	No
Recommendation	Remain as countryside
Reasoning	It is not intended to make any further allocations within Craven Arms, over and above those allocated within the SAMDev Plan (2015). The focus will therefore be on the delivery of the currently allocated sites.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	CRA029
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
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:	5%
All or part of the site within a Source	
Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Not Assessed
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Not Assessed
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct	
Access, Can One Reasonably Be	
Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	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	24
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	Nego
Significant Constraints:	None

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	EcIA required as potential for bats and nesting birds in the buildings and trees.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	Mitigation for bats may be required if present.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Opening up the north eastern corner to make the most of the access to the river would add value to either commercial or residential properties. Consider how this might fit into access along the water course.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Part of a larger SAMDev allocation. Site c. 35m N, and within setting of, Craven Arms Conservation Area.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of Conservation Area)
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	A development that demonstrates high quality design would likely significantly enhance the setting of the CA.
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	There are a few trees on site that offer some amenity to the area but not of such significance as to be a constraint on development
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Good design could incorporate new screen planting on the eastern boundary.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Good design could incorporate new screen planting on the eastern boundary.

Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Part of a larger SAMDev allocation. Site c. 35m N, and within setting of, Craven Arms Conservation Area.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of Conservation Area)
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	A development that demonstrates high quality design would likely significantly enhance the setting of the CA.
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 500 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment land for Craven Arms in the period to 2026. At the meeting of Craven Arms Town Council on 28th August 2018, Shropshire Council recommended that this strategy remained sufficiently robust to continue to meet the needs of the community of Craven Arms as part of the Local Plan review for the period 2016 to 2036 and the housing and employment guideline figures should be sustained over this revised plan period. Existing commitments and allocations in Craven Arms will fulfil the employment guideline figure and current housing commitments leave a residual requirement for land for 91 dwellings. Craven Arms Town Council have therefore resolved to continue to pursue this strategy and to accept the residual requirement for 91 dwellings as an allowance for further, unidentified (windfall) housing sites to come forward over the revised plan period to 2036. There is therefore, no intention to make any further housing or employment allocations in Craven Arms.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	Yes
Potential for Allocation?	No
Recommendation	Potential, small scale, brownfield redevelopment opportunity
Reasoning	It is not intended to make any further allocations within Craven Arms, over and above those allocated within the SAMDev Plan (2015). The focus will therefore be on the delivery of the currently allocated sites.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	CRA030
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	
Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	10%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	12%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	88%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year	20/
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	00/
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	40/
surface flood risk zone:	4%
Percentage of the site identified on the	20/
EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	201
historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	
detailed river network:	11%
All or part of the site within a Source	
Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium and High
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Medium and Medium-Low
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct	
Access, Can One Reasonably Be	
Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Y
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing	
Highway at Access Point is Not	
Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made	
So?	
Highway Comments - Could the	v
Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Y
VV01K5?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged	
Off-Site Works Achievable?	
Linducture Association Desting (Our Of	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	14
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	
Transport Service):	
	Presence of habitats of principle importance (grassland most likely in this case) in the western
	section to be determined by an EclA including a detailed National Vegetation Classification
Ecology Comments	level survey. If species-rich priority grassland is present avoidance measures may reduce the
Significant Constraints:	area of the site available to the point where the site is not viable. Therefore application could
	be refused under MD12. Within Env. Network and so CS17 applies. Housing would
	reduce/damage the corridor.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	Grassland may be core habitat if species-rich. EcIA would be required of several features including the thin woodland alongside the road, the mature in-field and boundary trees and the pond 84m away and over the road to the west. A footpath runs through the southern boundary. It appears that a pond in the southern
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	If mitigation of the grassland and woodland is required the loss of area might constrain development to the eastern area. The loss of hedgerow would require mitigation on site. Greenspace could be focussed on the western portion of the development. Some mitigation land may also be required if Great Crested Newts are found in the pond to the west of the road.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	There are opportunities to widen the woodland strip alongside the road and make features of the large in-field trees. There is also an opportunity to create a footpath across the site from opposite where the road to Cheney Longville joins the A49, to the river where a footbridge could be installed and thereby creating a circular path. The culverted watercourse across the site could be opened up and turned into a feature to complement SUDS features.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	SAMDev allocation. Site forms part of the late 19th century park-like ground of The Grove (HER PRNs 07031 & 16188), and S part of site may form part of the setting of the Grade II listed Grove Lodge (NHLE ref. 1269759). Site includes part of Craven Arms Marching Camp C (HER PRN 02041), an important Roman military sites, and possibly some earthwork remains of ridge and furrow (HER PRN 33214). Site is therefore known have archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of Grove Lodge and parkland; archaeological desk based assessment + field evaluation)
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	Design solution of avoidance of most significant archaeological features should be considered; design of site landscaping and hard and soft landscaping could reference and interpret Roman military archaeology and retain parkland planting within the site.
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	The area is open parkland with scattered mature trees forming a wood pasture landscape that complements the AONB and River Onny Valley, this locally rare landscape feature would be lost or significantly eroded if the site was developed .
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	Mature parkland trees abound throughout the site, due to their age and size these are not necessarily compatible with being close to built structures especially domestic structures. A band of mature trees runs along the west boundary of this site, they form an important feature in the landscape and incorporate one side of an avenue along the A49. These features should be protected conserved and enhanced by any new development.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape impact assessment necessary. Sustainable landscape buffers between boundaries . The mature hedgerows, trees and woodland block need to be integrated and enhanced sustainably into any new development, with appropriate levels of landscape mitigation and new tree planting.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through protecting restoring or enhancing the existing trees hedgerows / habitat corridors and the inclusion of sustainable spaces for strategic tree planting alongside the site margins and within the site.

SAMDev allocation. Site forms part of the late 19th century park-like ground of The Grove (HER PRNs 07031 & 16188), and S part of site may form part of the setting of the Grade II listed Grove Lodge (NHLE ref. 1269759). Site includes part of Craven Arms Marching Camp C (HER PRN 02041), an important Roman military sites, and possibly some earthwork remains of ridge and furrow (HER PRN 33214). Site is therefore known have archaeological potential.
Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of Grove Lodge and parkland; archaeological desk based assessment + field evaluation)
Design solution of avoidance of most significant archaeological features should be considered; design of site landscaping and hard and soft landscaping could reference and interpret Roman military archaeology and retain parkland planting within the site.
Poor
The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 500 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment land for Craven Arms in the period to 2026. At the meeting of Craven Arms Town Council on 28th August 2018, Shropshire Council recommended that this strategy remained sufficiently robust to continue to meet the needs of the community of Craven Arms as part of the Local Plan review for the period 2016 to 2036 and the housing and employment guideline figures should be sustained over this revised plan period. Existing commitments and allocations in Craven Arms will fulfil the employment guideline figure and current housing commitments leave a residual requirement for land for 91 dwellings. Craven Arms Town Council have therefore resolved to continue to pursue this strategy and to accept the residual requirement for 91 dwellings as an allowance for further, unidentified (windfall) housing sites to come forward over the revised plan period to 2036. There is therefore, no intention to make any further housing or employment allocations in Craven Arms.
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.
No
No
Sustain the current employment allocation
It is not intended to make any further allocations within Craven Arms, over and above those
allocated within the SAMDev Plan (2015). The focus will therefore be on the delivery of the currently allocated sites.

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	CRA031
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year	100/0
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	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	15%
detailed river network:	13/0
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	Not Assessed
(from the LVSS)	
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Not Assessed
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct	
Access, Can One Reasonably Be	
Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	γ
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	Ŷ
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged	
Off-Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	21
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	If the large pond present contains Great Crested Newts the mitigation land required may
Significant Constraints:	reduce the viability of this site.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	EcIA required. The pond is likely to be priority habitat. A small, open water course crosses the site. There are hedgerows around parts of the site, some mature trees in the boundaries and a small band of young woodland on the southern border.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	The pond and small water course would require a significant buffer and additional land if great Crested Newts are present. Boundary hedgerows, trees and the footpath would also require consideration and replacement if removed.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	The pond and water course could be enhanced as part of any development and built in to and SUDS feature
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	SAMDev allocation. Site includes part of Craven Arms Marching Camp C (HER PRN 02041) and also adjacent to Craven Arms Marching Camp B (HER PRN 00620) and part of Craven Arms Marching Camp C (HER PRN 02041), both of which comprise important Roman military sites. Site is therefore known have archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological desk based assessment + field evaluation)
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	Design solution of avoidance of most significant archaeological features should be considered; design of site landscaping and hard and soft landscaping could reference and interpret Roman military archaeology.
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	Mature and semi-mature roadside trees form part of an important avenue and local landscape feature, mature hedgerows on site. These features should be protected conserved and enhanced by any new development. New access off the A49 will introduce pressure to remove sections of boundary hedge and trees the impacts and mitigation of / for such losses need to be considered and justified.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Sustainable landscape buffers between boundaries . The mature hedgerows, trees and avenue need to be integrated and enhanced sustainably into any new development, with appropriate levels of landscape mitigation and new tree planting.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through protecting restoring or enhancing the existing trees hedgerows / habitat corridors and the inclusion of sustainable spaces for strategic tree planting alongside the site margins and within the site.

Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	SAMDev allocation. Site includes part of Craven Arms Marching Camp C (HER PRN 02041) and also adjacent to Craven Arms Marching Camp B (HER PRN 00620) and part of Craven Arms Marching Camp C (HER PRN 02041), both of which comprise important Roman military sites. Site is therefore known have archaeological potential.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological desk based assessment + field evaluation)
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	Design solution of avoidance of most significant archaeological features should be considered; design of site landscaping and hard and soft landscaping could reference and interpret Roman military archaeology.
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Fair
Strategic Considerations:	The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 500 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment land for Craven Arms in the period to 2026. At the meeting of Craven Arms Town Council on 28th August 2018, Shropshire Council recommended that this strategy remained sufficiently robust to continue to meet the needs of the community of Craven Arms as part of the Local Plan review for the period 2016 to 2036 and the housing and employment guideline figures should be sustained over this revised plan period. Existing commitments and allocations in Craven Arms will fulfil the employment guideline figure and current housing commitments leave a residual requirement for land for 91 dwellings. Craven Arms Town Council have therefore resolved to continue to pursue this strategy and to accept the residual requirement for 91 dwellings as an allowance for further, unidentified (windfall) housing sites to come forward over the revised plan period to 2036. There is therefore, no intention to make any further housing or employment allocations in Craven Arms.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	Νο
Potential for Allocation?	No
Recommendation	Sustain the current employment allocation
Reasoning	It is not intended to make any further allocations within Craven Arms, over and above those allocated within the SAMDev Plan (2015). The focus will therefore be on the delivery of the currently allocated sites.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	
- co.Bit negati efficitio.	1

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	CRA032
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	
Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year	201
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	201
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	201
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:	2%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	
detailed river network:	14%
All or part of the site within a Source	
Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Not Assessed
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	Not Assessed
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	У
Highway Comments - If No Direct	
Access, Can One Reasonably Be	
Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Y
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing	
Highway at Access Point is Not	
Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made	
So? Hishway Comments Could the	
Highway Comments - Could the	V
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Y
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged	Y. Contribution to improvements to western end of Long La and Watling St / Long La junction
Off-Site Works Achievable?	needed
Linducture Association Desting (Out Of	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of	
24) (Based on Primary School, GP	20
Surgery, Convenience Store & Public	
Transport Service):	
Ecology Comments	
Significant Constraints:	None
Significant constraints.	

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	EcIA required of the pond in the field to the east over the railway line and the small water course. Some mitigation land may be required if Great Crested Newts are found. Significant boundary trees and species-rich hedgerows are present on the southern and western boundaries. The partially culverted water course may support some interest.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	Greenspace could be located to the east of the site if GCN are found in the pond. Buffers of the water course should be provided.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	The water course could be opened up for its full length and a feature made of it. The environmental network along the western boundary could be enhanced by broadening it.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	SAMDev allocation. Site adjacent to Watling Street South Roman road (HER PRN 00108), and includes majority of Craven Arms Marching Camp B (HER PRN 00620) and part of Craven Arms Marching Camp C (HER PRN 02041), both of which comprise important Roman military sites. Site is therefore known have archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (field evaluation [geophysical survey and trial trenching]). NB Desk Based Assessment by SLR consulting prepared in 2014 for the S end of site.
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	Design solution of avoidance of most significant archaeological features should be considered; design of site landscaping and hard and soft landscaping could reference and interpret Roman military archaeology.
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	The north-west and Long Lane boundaries are defined by mature (possibly important) hedgerows with a number of mature roadside trees on the Long Lane boundary. These features should be protected conserved and enhanced by any new development. New access off Long Lane will introduce pressure to remove sections of boundary hedge and trees, the impacts and mitigation of / for such losses need to be considered and justified.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape impact assessment required to inform a sustainable site layout that includes appropriate space for strategic tree planting that in the long-term will mature and integrate the site into the landscape. Translocation of existing mature roadside hedgerow to the new site boundary and or compensatory native species hedgerow planting to compensate for any losses / visibility splays' etc.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through protecting restoring or enhancing the existing trees hedgerows / habitat corridors and the inclusion of sustainable spaces for strategic tree planting alongside the site margins and within the site.

Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	SAMDev allocation. Site adjacent to Watling Street South Roman road (HER PRN 00108),and includes majority of Craven Arms Marching Camp B (HER PRN 00620) and part of Craven Arms Marching Camp C (HER PRN 02041), both of which comprise important Roman military sites. Site is therefore known have archaeological potential.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (field evaluation [geophysical survey and trial trenching]). NB Desk Based Assessment by SLR consulting prepared in 2014 for the S end of site.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	Design solution of avoidance of most significant archaeological features should be considered; design of site landscaping and hard and soft landscaping could reference and interpret Roman military archaeology.
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Fair
Strategic Considerations:	The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 500 dwellings and 14 hectares of employment land for Craven Arms in the period to 2026. At the meeting of Craven Arms Town Council on 28th August 2018, Shropshire Council recommended that this strategy remained sufficiently robust to continue to meet the needs of the community of Craven Arms as part of the Local Plan review for the period 2016 to 2036 and the housing and employment guideline figures should be sustained over this revised plan period. Existing commitments and allocations in Craven Arms will fulfil the employment guideline figure and current housing commitments leave a residual requirement for land for 91 dwellings. Craven Arms Town Council have therefore resolved to continue to pursue this strategy and to accept the residual requirement for 91 dwellings as an allowance for further, unidentified (windfall) housing sites to come forward over the revised plan period to 2036. There is therefore, no intention to make any further housing or employment allocations in Craven Arms.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	No
Potential for Allocation?	No
Recommendation	Sustain the current employment allocation
Reasoning	It is not intended to make any further allocations within Craven Arms, over and above those allocated within the SAMDev Plan (2015). The focus will therefore be on the delivery of the currently allocated sites.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	
Capacity:	<u> </u>
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	1