

# Appendix N

## Much Wenlock 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.*

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

#### Stage 2a: Sustainability Appraisal

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

#### Stage 2b: Screening of Sites

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

#### Stage 3: Detailed site review

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

**This stage of assessment was an iterative process.**

## 2. The Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)

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

### **Assessing Suitability:**

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

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

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

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

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

## 2.5. Reflecting upon the above factors:

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

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

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

### **Assessing Availability:**

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

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

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

### **Assessing Achievability (including Viability)**

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

### **Conclusion**

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

## **3. Sustainability Appraisal (SA)**

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

---

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

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

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

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

#### 4. Screening of Sites

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

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

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

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

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

*\*Significant physical constraints:*

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

*\*\*Significant natural environment/heritage constraints:*

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

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

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

**Please Note:**

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

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

## **5. Detailed Site Review**

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

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

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

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

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



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

**5.2. This stage of assessment was an iterative process.**

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

Much Wenlock Place Plan Area  
Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:  
Site Assessments

# Key Centre: Much Wenlock

| Criteria  | Criteria Description  | Scoring Guide                                       | Site Ref:<br>MUW001 | Site Ref:<br>MUW002 | Site Ref:<br>MUW003 | Site Ref:<br>MUW006 | Site Ref:<br>MUW007 | Site Ref:<br>MUW008 | Site Ref:<br>MUW009 | Site Ref:<br>MUW010 | Site Ref:<br>MUW011 | Site Ref:<br>MUW012 | Site Ref:<br>MUW012VAR | Site Ref:<br>MUW013 |
|---|---|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1   | <b>Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>   |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |                     |
|   | Special Area of Conservation  | Yes = double minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0) | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | Ramsar Site   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | National Nature Reserve   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | Site of Special Scientific Interest   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | Ancient Woodland  |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | Wildlife Site   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
| Local Nature Reserve  | 0   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      |                     |
| 2   | <b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>1</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>   |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |                     |
|   | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation   | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | 1km of a Ramsar Site  |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | 500m of a National Nature Reserve   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest   |   | -                   | 0                   | -                   | 0                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | 0                   | 0                      | -                   |
|   | 500m of Ancient woodland  |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | -                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | 250m of a Wildlife Site   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | -                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve  | 0   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      |                     |
| 3   | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | -                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
| 4   | <b>Site contains one or more (or part) of the following<sup>2</sup> (record all that apply):</b>  |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |                     |
|   | Children's playground   | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | Outdoor sports facility   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | Amenity green space   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | 0   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      |                     |
| 5   | <b>Site boundary within 480m<sup>3</sup> of one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>   |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |                     |
|   | Primary School  | Yes = plus score (+)<br>No = minus score (-)        | -                   | -                   | -                   | +                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | +                   | +                      | -                   |
|   | GP surgery  |   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      | -                   |
|   | Library(permanent or mobile library stop)   |   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      | -                   |
|   | Leisure centre  |   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | +                   | +                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      | -                   |
|   | Children's playground   |   | -                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      | -                   |
|   | Outdoor sports facility   |   | -                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | -                   | -                   | +                   | +                      | -                   |
|   | Amenity green space   |   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | -                   | -                   | +                   | +                      | -                   |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)                                     | -   |   | +                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | +                   | +                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      |                     |
| 6   | Site boundary within 480m <sup>3</sup> of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times <sup>4</sup> :      | Yes = plus score (+)<br>No = minus score (-)        | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | -                   | -                   | +                   | +                      | -                   |
| 7   | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile)  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                      | -                   |
| 8   | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)   | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | 0                   | 0                   | -                   | -                      | 0                   |
| 9   | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
| 10  | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
| 11  | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+)<br>No = zero score (0)         | +                   | +                   | 0                   | 0                   | +                   | 0                   | +                   | 0                   | +                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
| 12  | Site would displace an existing waste management operation  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | -                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
| 13  | <b>Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply):</b>   |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |                     |
|   | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone  | Yes = double minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0) | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | a Scheduled Monument  |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | a Registered Battlefield  |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | a Registered Park or Garden   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | a Conservation Area   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
| a Listed Building   | 0   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      |                     |
| 14  | <b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>5</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>   |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |                     |
|   | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | 300m of a Scheduled Monument  |   | -                   | -                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | -                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | 300m of a Registered Battlefield  |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | 300m of a Conservation Area   |   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | 0                   | 0                   | -                   | -                      | 0                   |
| 300m of a Listed Building   | -   |   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      |                     |
| 15  | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential   | Double minus score (-)                              |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |                     |
|   | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential  | Minus score (-)                                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |                     |
|   | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential                                  | Zero score (0)                                      |                     |                     | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                      | 0                   |
|   | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary                             | Plus score (+)                                      | +                   | +                   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |                     |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded |   |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |                     |
| <b>Overall Score</b>  |   |   | -6                  | 1                   | -2                  | 1                   | -1                  | -1                  | -2                  | -11                 | -11                 | -4                  | -4                     | -11                 |
| <b>Overall Sustainability Conclusion</b>  |   |   | Fair                | Good                | Good                | Good                | Good                | Good                | Good                | Poor                | Poor                | Fair                | Fair                   | Poor                |
| Range is 1 to -11 Good is 1 to -3 Fair is -4 to -7 Poor is -8 to -11                                  |   |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |                     |

| Criteria  | Criteria Description  | Scoring Guide                                       | Site Ref:   | Site Ref:   | Site Ref:   | Site Ref:   | Site Ref:   |
|---|---|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|   |   |   | MUW014      | MUW015      | MUW016      | MUW016VAR   | MUW017      |
| 1   | <b>Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>   |   |             |             |             |             |             |
|   | Special Area of Conservation  | Yes = double minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0) | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | Ramsar Site   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | National Nature Reserve   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | Site of Special Scientific Interest   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | Ancient Woodland  |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | Wildlife Site   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| Local Nature Reserve  | 0   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |             |
| 2   | <b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>1</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>   |   |             |             |             |             |             |
|   | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation   | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | 1km of a Ramsar Site  |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | 500m of a National Nature Reserve   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest   |   | -           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | 500m of Ancient woodland  |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | 250m of a Wildlife Site   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve  | 0   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |             |
| 3   | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| 4   | <b>Site contains one or more (or part) of the following<sup>2</sup> (record all that apply):</b>  |   |             |             |             |             |             |
|   | Children's playground   | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | Outdoor sports facility   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | Amenity green space   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)   | 0   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |             |
| 5   | <b>Site boundary within 480m<sup>3</sup> of one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>   |   |             |             |             |             |             |
|   | Primary School  | Yes = plus score (+)<br>No = minus score (-)        | -           | +           | -           | +           | +           |
|   | GP surgery  |   | -           | +           | -           | -           | -           |
|   | Library(permanent or mobile library stop)   |   | -           | +           | -           | -           | -           |
|   | Leisure centre  |   | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
|   | Children's playground   |   | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
|   | Outdoor sports facility   |   | -           | +           | +           | +           | +           |
|   | Amenity green space   |   | -           | +           | +           | +           | +           |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)   | -   |   | -           | -           | -           | -           |             |
| 6   | Site boundary within 480m <sup>3</sup> of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times <sup>4</sup> :      | Yes = plus score (+)<br>No = minus score (-)        | +           | +           | +           | +           | +           |
| 7   | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile)  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| 8   | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)   | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | -           | -           | -           | 0           | -           |
| 9   | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| 10  | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| 11  | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+)<br>No = zero score (0)         | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| 12  | Site would displace an existing waste management operation  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| 13  | <b>Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply):</b>   |   |             |             |             |             |             |
|   | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone  | Yes = double minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0) | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | a Scheduled Monument  |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | a Registered Battlefield  |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | a Registered Park or Garden   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | a Conservation Area   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| a Listed Building   | 0   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |             |
| 14  | <b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>5</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>   |   |             |             |             |             |             |
|   | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | 300m of a Scheduled Monument  |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | 300m of a Registered Battlefield  |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden   |   | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
|   | 300m of a Conservation Area   |   | -           | -           | 0           | 0           | -           |
| 300m of a Listed Building   | 0   |   | -           | 0           | 0           | 0           |             |
| 15  | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential   | Double minus score (-)                              |             |             |             |             | --          |
|   | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential  | Minus score (-)                                     |             |             |             |             |             |
|   | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential                                  | Zero score (0)                                      | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           |             |
|   | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary                             | Plus score (+)                                      |             |             |             |             |             |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded         |   |   |             |             |             |             |             |
| <b>Overall Score</b>  |   |   | <b>-11</b>  | <b>-1</b>   | <b>-5</b>   | <b>-2</b>   | <b>-6</b>   |
| Range is 1 to -11 Good is 1 to -3 Fair is -4 to -7 Poor is -8 to -11 <b>Overall Sustainability Conclusion</b> |   |   | <b>Poor</b> | <b>Good</b> | <b>Fair</b> | <b>Good</b> | <b>Fair</b> |

# Community Hub: Cressage

| Criteria  | Criteria Description  | Scoring Guide                                       | Site Ref:<br>CES001 | Site Ref:<br>CES002 | Site Ref:<br>CES003 | Site Ref:<br>CES004 | Site Ref:<br>CES005 | Site Ref:<br>CES006 |
|---|---|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1   | <b>Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>   |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |
|   | Special Area of Conservation  | Yes = double minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0) | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | Ramsar Site   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | National Nature Reserve   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | Site of Special Scientific Interest   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | Ancient Woodland  |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | Wildlife Site   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Local Nature Reserve  | 0   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |                     |
| 2   | <b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>1</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>   |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |
|   | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation   | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | 1km of a Ramsar Site  |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | 500m of a National Nature Reserve   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | 500m of Ancient woodland  |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | 250m of a Wildlife Site   |   | 0                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   |
| 100m of a Local Nature Reserve  | 0   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |                     |
| 3   | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| 4   | <b>Site contains one or more (or part) of the following<sup>2</sup> (record all that apply):</b>  |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |
|   | Children's playground   | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | Outdoor sports facility   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | Amenity green space   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)   | 0   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |                     |
| 5   | <b>Site boundary within 480m<sup>3</sup> of one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>   |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |
|   | Primary School  | Yes = plus score (+)<br>No = minus score (-)        | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   |
|   | GP surgery  |   | -                   | -                   | +                   | +                   | -                   | -                   |
|   | Library(permanent or mobile library stop)   |   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   |
|   | Leisure centre  |   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   |
|   | Children's playground   |   | -                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   |
|   | Outdoor sports facility   |   | -                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   |
|   | Amenity green space   |   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   |
| Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)   | +   |   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   |                     |
| 6   | Site boundary within 480m <sup>3</sup> of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times <sup>4</sup> :      | Yes = plus score (+)<br>No = minus score (-)        | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   | +                   |
| 7   | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile)  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   | -                   |
| 8   | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)   | Yes = minus score (-)<br>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 (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | -                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| 10  | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| 11  | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+)<br>No = zero score (0)         | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | +                   | 0                   | +                   |
| 12  | Site would displace an existing waste management operation  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| 13  | <b>Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply):</b>   |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |
|   | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone  | Yes = double minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0) | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | a Scheduled Monument  |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | a Registered Battlefield  |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | a Registered Park or Garden   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | a Conservation Area   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | a Listed Building   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | 0   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |                     |
| 14  | <b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>5</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>   |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |
|   | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone  | Yes = minus score (-)<br>No = zero score (0)        | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | 300m of a Scheduled Monument  |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | 300m of a Registered Battlefield  |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
|   | 300m of a Conservation Area   |   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |
| 300m of a Listed Building   | -   |   | -                   | 0                   | -                   | -                   | -                   |                     |
| 15  | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential   | Double minus score (-)                              |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |
|   | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential  | Minus score (-)                                     |                     |                     |                     | not assessed        |                     | not assessed        |
|   | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential                                  | Zero score (0)                                      | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |                     | 0                   |                     |
|   | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary                             | Plus score (+)                                      |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |
|   | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded   |   |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |
| <b>Overall Score</b>  |   |   | <b>-7</b>           | <b>-3</b>           | <b>0</b>            | <b>0</b>            | <b>-2</b>           | <b>-1</b>           |
| <b>Overall Sustainability Conclusion</b><br>(Number of sites is too small to enable robust conclusion on Good/Fair/Poor rating) |   |   | <b>-7</b>           | <b>-3</b>           | <b>0</b>            | <b>0</b>            | <b>-2</b>           | <b>-1</b>           |

**Much Wenlock Place Plan Area  
Stage 2b Screening of Sites:  
Site Assessments**



# Key Centre: Much Wenlock

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW001</b>   |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Smithfield Works, Much Wenlock  |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock  |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 0.55  |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 17  |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Brownfield  |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A   |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Currently used for commercial vehicle sales repair and storage. Large warehouse/depot building remainder concrete/hard standing for vehicle storage and parking. Hard boundaries to all sides. NE boundary with Bridge St, S boundary with Fire Station, SW boundary with residential, NW boundary with mature trees onto Southfield Rd |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Urban surroundings - residential streets to N, E and W. South boundary with existing Fire Sta. Site is well contained and related to existing urban environment.  |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Currently Suitable  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so   |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.  |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              |   |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |   |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |   |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>  |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW002</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Builders Yard, New Road, Much Wenlock  |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 0.38   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 11   |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Brownfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Brownfield site within development boundary. Currently in use as Travis Perkins Builders yard for retail and commercial sales. Residential use to N,W (past amenity green space) and E telephone exchange (MUW001) to S. Site boundaries are clearly defined by neighbouring uses to N and S with Smithfield Rd to E and to W to amenity green space by established trees and hedgerow. Site has long standing (130+ years) history of commercial and industrial use including rail line/sidings, coal storage, and depot. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to Smithfield Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access also via Smithfield Rd to existing established links. |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Mixed use urban area.  |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Currently Suitable   |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Availability Unknown   |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.   |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              | <b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        | <b>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).</b>  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>  |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW003</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Southfields Road, Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 1.22   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 37   |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Single field in agricultural use - arable. Adjacent to built up area (development boundary) on SE and SW boundaries. Boundaries defined by hedges/trees  |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Woodland to NW; residential and Care Home (the Wheatlands) to SE and SW; access track, allotments and arable field to NE. Boundaries are well defined either as field boundary or by hedges/trees and track. Adjoins existing built up area and would extend built up area into surrounding countryside. |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Currently Available  |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.   |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              |  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW006</b>   |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Land to the rear of the cemetery and north of Oakfield Park, Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock  |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 12.13   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 364   |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield  |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A   |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Agricultural land, arable and grazing. Segment on E side in use as allotments and with extant pp for cemetery extension. Site rises significantly from NE to SW. N element of site well related to existing settlement; S element would be extension of existing Oakfield Park into countryside. Boundaries well established on all sides: W field boundary of established trees and hedgerow, NW with Bourton Rd and residential properties and Gaskell Arms Hotel, E with Bridgnorth Rd (A458), SE with cemetery and Oakfield Park residential properties. Site bisected by track known as Dark Lane. |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Agricultural land to NW, W, and SW. Residential to SE (Oakfield Park), E cemetery, NE A458 and urban area, N residential and Gaskell Arms Hotel.  |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential   |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Availability Unknown  |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.  |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              | <b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>   |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |   |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |   |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW007</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Land off Bourton Road, Much Wenlock  |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 16.68  |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 501  |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Site largely agricultural grazing and arable. Small area in NE corner used as car park for Vets; area of (managed?) woodland on N boundary; on NW boundary area used for storage and distribution of building and farm materials. Boundaries strong to N and NW with residential properties and businesses; to E with Bourton Rd; to W and S field boundaries of hedgerows and individual trees. Reasonably related to existing settlement and ribbon development along Stretton Rd but would extend urban area into countryside. Site rises from NE to SW |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Urban in character to N NE and NW, agricultural to S and E.  |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Availability Unknown   |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.   |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              | <b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>  |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW008</b>   |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Land to the south of Sytche Lane, Much Wenlock  |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock  |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 11.12   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 334   |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield  |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A   |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Site includes MUW003. Site largely in agricultural use - grazing and arable fields. Area on W boundary in use as allotments; area on N boundary developed for 13 affordable housing; area in NW corner pp for town flood attenuation pond. Site rises from W to E. Strong boundaries to N with Sytche La, E with Sheinton St and properties on Southfield Rd and S with Wheatlands Residential Home. W obvious hedgerow boundaries with adjacent fields and woodland. |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | W agricultural fields and woodlands. S and E residential properties and Wheatlands Home. N residential properties, Sytche lane and caravan park (touring).  |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential   |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Currently Available   |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.  |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              |   |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |   |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |   |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>  |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW009</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Sytche Caravan and Camping Park, west of Much Wenlock  |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 4.66   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 140  |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Mixed  |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | 10%  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Site is mixed greenfield/brownfield site outside and away from development boundary to W of town. Site is currently in use as touring caravan/camping site on S half whilst N half remains in agricultural use for grazing/fodder crops. Caravan site area has hard standing pitches, grass pitches, surfaced access roads, amenity blocks and reception building. Site is bounded by agricultural land to N, S, and W and by woodland/forestry to E. Site boundaries are comprised of trees and established hedgerows on all sides whilst boundary between caravan site and agricultural use is also trees and hedgerow. Site has vehicle access from Sytche Lane but no road frontage as such. Pedestrian and cycle access also via Sytche Lane to established networks. Site is not well related to existing development. Site rises from S-N towards Wenlock Edge. |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Farmland and woodland  |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Suitable   |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Currently Available  |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.   |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              | <b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>   |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       | The site is separated from the built form of Much Wenlock by land that has not been promoted for consideration.  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>  |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.



**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW010</b>   |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | The Grange, south of Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock  |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 3.85  |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 115   |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield  |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A   |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Greenfield site outside and away from development boundary. Site is currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site is surrounded by agricultural land including the Grange farm complex and additional residential conversion on SW corner of site. Site is bounded by B4371 - Stretton Rd to N and disused rail line to SE. Boundaries defined by mature trees and established hedgerows on all sides. Site has road frontage and vehicle access to Stretton Rd. No existing pedestrian links cycle links and access via Stetton Rd to established network. |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Agricultural  |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Suitable  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Currently Available   |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.  |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              | <b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |   |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       | <b>In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint).</b>   |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>  |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW011</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Bridge House, Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 0.61   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 18   |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Brownfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Brownfield site within development boundary on edge of built up area. Part of site is used for vehicle dismantling and storage and remainder for car parking. Car park on N portion of site is part of neighbouring SAMDev employment allocation. Site has road frontage and vehicle access from Stretton Rd although this is across the allocated employment site. Pedestrian and cycle access along Stretton Rd to established networks. Site boundaries are comprised of trees and hedgerows except on NW corner where no physical boundary exists with SC freehold land. Site is bounded by car park to W; Stretton Rd and residential properties to N; and farmland to S. |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Mixed including residential, commercial and agricultural.  |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Currently Available  |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.   |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              |  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW012</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Land adjoining the Primary School and Hunters Gate, Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 3.81   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 114  |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently in agricultural use for fodder/arable drops. Site is bounded by MW Primary school and Hunters Gate estate development to N and further residential development to E: by agricultural land to S and A458 and Oakfield Park estate development to W. Boundaries defined by hedgerows or fences with adjacent residential properties. Site has road frontage and vehicle access to A458 and Hunters Gate. Pedestrian and cycle access via same routes to existing networks. |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Agricultural to south and south west. Residential to north, east and north west.   |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Currently Available  |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.   |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              |  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW012VAR</b>   |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Land adjoining the Primary School and Hunters Gate, Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 5.86   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 176  |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Greenfield site consisting of two agricultural fields, outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently in agricultural use for fodder/arable crops. Site is bounded by MW Primary school and Hunters Gate estate development to N and further residential development to NE: by agricultural land to SE and S and A458 to W. Boundaries defined by hedgerows or fences with adjacent residential properties. Site has road frontage and vehicle access to A458 and Hunters Gate. Pedestrian and cycle access via same routes to existing networks. |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Agricultural to south, south west and south east. Residential to north, north west and north east.   |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | N/A  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Currently Available  |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.   |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              |  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       | The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA.  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW013</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Land at Stretton Road, Much Wenlock  |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 1.68   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 50   |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Agricultural field to the south west of Much Wenlock. The south east portion of the site is the subject of a Planning Permission for an attenuation pond.  |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Agricultural to the south east, south west and north west. Employment to the north east.   |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Availability Unknown   |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              | <b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>  |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW014</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Land north of Stretton Road, Much Wenlock  |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 0.50   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 15   |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Triangular shaped field located to the west of Much Wenlock. The site is bordered by a National Trust car park to the west, a footpath to the north, residential curtilages to the east and Stretton Road to the south.        |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Character to the north and west is predominantly agricultural/rural. Character to the east and south is residential.   |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Currently Available  |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              |  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW015</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Land to the west of Bridgnorth Road, Much Wenlock  |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 1.40   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 42   |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Linear site following Bridgnorth Road. The site consists of part of two agricultural fields.   |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Character to the west and south is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north and east is predominantly residential (there is a garage/petrol station across the road from the site).                                  |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Availability Unknown   |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              | <b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>  |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW016</b>  |
| <i>Site Address:</i>                            | Land to the south of Much Wenlock  |
| <i>Settlement:</i>                              | Much Wenlock   |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i>                          | 14.08  |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i>         | 422  |
| <i>Type of Site:</i>                            | Greenfield   |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i>         | N/A  |
| <i>General Description:</i>                     | Irregularly shaped agricultural field to the south of Much Wenlock.  |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i>                   | Character to the east, west and south is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north is a mix of agricultural and residential.  |
| <i>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</i> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential  |
| <i>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</i>    | Currently Available  |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| <b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>                |  |
| <b>Conclusion:      Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.



**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                       | <b>MUW016VAR</b>   |
| <i>Site Address:</i>                         | Land to the south of Much Wenlock  |
| <i>Settlement:</i>                           | Much Wenlock   |
| <i>Site Size (Ha):</i>                       | 2.78   |
| <i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i>      | 83   |
| <i>Type of Site:</i>                         | Greenfield   |
| <i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i>      | N/A  |
| <i>General Description:</i>                  | A small portion of a wider agricultural field. Site boundaries are defined by property curtilages to the north-west and field boundaries to the south-east. They are undefined to the north-east and south-west.               |
| <i>Surrounding Character:</i>                | Character to the east, west and south is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north is a mix of agricultural and residential.  |
| <i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i>  | N/A  |
| <i>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</i> | Currently Available  |
| <i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i>  | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| <b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>             |  |
| <b>Conclusion:      Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>    |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>    |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                              | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>MUW017</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Land to the south of Forrester Avenue, Much Wenlock  |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Much Wenlock   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 1.64   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 49   |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | The site consists of part of an agricultural field located to the south of Forrester Avenue and the settlement of Much Wenlock.  |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Character to the east, west and south is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north is predominantly residential.  |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Currently Available  |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              |  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

# Community Hub: Cressage

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>CES001</b>   |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Land north of Shrewsbury Road, Cressage   |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Cressage  |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 2.40  |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 72  |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield  |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A   |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Greenfield site on periphery of Cressage (no development boundary not hub or cluster in SAMDev). Currently in agricultural use as paddocks/rough grazing. Site has additional agricultural land to N, W, NE, and SW and individual residential properties to S and SE. Site has continuous boundary with disused rail line on N boundary and other boundaries clearly defined by established hedgerows or access track on SE boundary. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to A458 (Shrewsbury Rd). Pedestrian and cycle access via same route to existing established network. Site is almost entirely within flood zones 2 and 3. |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Mostly agricultural and open farmland with some individual properties .   |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Suitable  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>   | Availability Unknown  |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.  |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              | <b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b> <b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>  |
|   | <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       | <b>The majority of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3.</b>   |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>CES002</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Land west of Shore Lane, Cressage  |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Cressage   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 3.62   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 109  |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Greenfield site on periphery of Cressage (no development boundary not hub or cluster in SAMDev). Sub divided into number of smaller fields currently in agricultural use as paddocks/rough grazing. Site has additional agricultural land to S, W, SW, and SE and individual residential properties to N, E and SE. Site boundaries are clearly defined by hedgerows and trees on W, S and E sides and with residential properties along N boundary. Site has road frontage to Shore Lane and A458 (Shrewsbury Rd), current vehicle access is only via Shore Lane (single track) no access onto A458. Pedestrian and cycle access via A458 or Shore Lane to existing established networks - no pavement on Shore Lane. |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Mostly agricultural and open farmland with some individual properties .  |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>   | Currently Available  |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.   |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              | <b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>   |
|   | <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>   |
|   | <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>CES003</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | East of Cressage, adjacent to Sheinton Road  |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Cressage   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 5.78   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 173  |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Greenfield site on E periphery of Cressage (no development boundary not hub or cluster in SAMDev) adjoining residential development to W. Site is currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops. Site has residential use to W, GP surgery to NW and agricultural use to other 3 sides. Site boundaries are clearly defined to W with residential properties; to N with Sheinton Rd; to S by hedgerows and trees; to E there is no obvious physical boundary only arbitrary line on plan. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to Sheinton Rd pedestrian and cycle access also via Sheinton Rd to existing established network. |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Mostly agricultural and open farmland with residential estate development to W.  |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Availability Unknown   |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.   |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              | <b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>  |
| <b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>                |  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>  |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>CES004</b>   |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Land off Sheinton Road, Cressage  |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Cressage  |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 0.30  |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 9   |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Mixed   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | 30%   |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Former garages and storage site to rear of car park of the Eagles pub (dis) and garden land of properties to S. Site is therefore part brownfield (this part not currently in use) and tightly bounded by residential properties to N, E, S and SW with pub and car park to W. Boundaries themselves are clearly defined by neighbouring properties. Site does not have road frontage as such but has current vehicle access to Sheinton Rd. Pedestrian and cycle access also via Sheinton Rd to existing established network. Application (17/02913/FUL) for 8 dwellings and conversion of pub refused 20/06/2017 because conflict with policy - in countryside location, loss of community facility and heritage impacts. |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Residential and built up.   |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential   |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Availability Unknown  |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.  |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              | <b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>   |
| <b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>                |   |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |   |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |   |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>CES005</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | Land off Harley Road, Cressage   |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Cressage   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 2.40   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 72   |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Greenfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | Greenfield site on periphery of Cressage (no development boundary not hub or cluster in SAMDev). Currently in agricultural use for fodder crops/rough grazing. Site has residential use to N and E and agricultural uses to S and W. Site boundaries clearly defined by trees and hedgerows on all sides. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to Harley Rd (A458). Pedestrian and cycle access also via Harley Rd to existing established network. |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Character to the east is residential. Character to the south, west and north is rural.   |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Currently Available  |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.   |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              |  |
| <b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>                |  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.



**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference:</b>                          | <b>CES006</b>  |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                            | The Eagles, Sheinton Road, Cressage  |
| <b>Settlement:</b>                              | Cressage   |
| <b>Site Size (Ha):</b>                          | 0.23   |
| <b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>         | 7  |
| <b>Type of Site:</b>                            | Brownfield   |
| <b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>         | N/A  |
| <b>General Description:</b>                     | The site is in the middle of Cressage and comprises a closed public house (The Eagles) with car park. The building is beginning to deteriorate and the hardstanding is becoming overgrown.                                     |
| <b>Surrounding Character:</b>                   | Mostly residential, with some larger gardens backing on to the site. There is a wooded area to the east and the site occupies the corner of the junction between the A458 (Harley Road) and Sheinton Road.                     |
| <b>Suitability Information:<br/>(from SLAA)</b> | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential  |
| <b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>    | Currently Available  |
| <b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>     | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.<br>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| <b>Conclusion:</b>                              |  |
| <b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>                |  |
| <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>                        |  |
| <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>       |  |
| <b>Summary:</b>                                 | <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>   |

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Much Wenlock Place Plan Area  
Stage 3 Detailed Site Review:  
Site Assessments**

# Key Centre: Much Wenlock

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |               |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>MUW001</b> |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No            |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | No            |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes           |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%            |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%            |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%          |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 0%            |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%            |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%            |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%            |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 0%            |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 0%            |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | Yes           |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Not Assessed  |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Not Assessed  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | Y             |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   |               |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | Y             |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              |               |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | Y             |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  |               |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> | 20            |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>           | None   |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                 | None   |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>         | None   |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                     | Landscaping with biodiversity value, especially adjacent to trees to northwest.  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>          |  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                | Site located close to the boundary, and within the setting of, the Much Wenlock Conservation Area and potentially within the setting of the Grade II listed 6 & 7 Smithfield Road (NHLE ref. 1261504) and other non-designated historic buildings. Also site of Much Wenlock's former Smithfield (HER PRN 05218) |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>        | Heritage Assessment required with application (setting assessment)   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                    | Good quality design could provide an enhancement over the existing commercial usage.   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>              |  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                    | Mature trees to north-west of site   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>            | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                        | landscaping to enhance internal landscape of site  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i> |  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>       | Potential for contaminated land from past land use. Possible noise impacts from the A4169 Smithfield Road.   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                             | Remediation probable for con land. Layout and orientation likely to be able to remove noise concerns (have nearest houses set back from the Smithfield Road and fire station. Additionally glazing, ventilation and boundary treatment possible for noise if required. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>   | Reduced noise to nearby existing residential properties by removing commercial activities and providing more screening to existing rear gardens.   |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>                                   | Fair   |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | Brownfield site in an accessible location within the built form of the settlement  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> | Assess impact on flood risk<br>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.   |
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>   | Yes  |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Potential windfall site  |
| <b>Reasoning</b>   | Accessible site within the body of the town which would lend itself well to redevelopment  |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>                                   | n/a  |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>                                   | n/a  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |  |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>MUW003</b>  |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No   |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | Yes  |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 0%   |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | Yes  |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium-High  |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium-High  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   |  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              |  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | N  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  | N. If MUW003 is developed as a standalone site (i.e. not part of MUW008) then it would not have access to Sytche Lane and would have to access the highway network via Bridge Road. A further 40 houses using the narrow bridge on bridge street would not be acceptable and the site is unlikely to be able to achieve the removal of the bridge, assuming this would be acceptable to the community. |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> | 18   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>           |  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                 |  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>         |  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                     |  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>          | N/A  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                | N/A  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>        |  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                    |  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>              |  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                    | Field boundary trees and hedges around and across site. Large block of woodland adjoining most of north-west boundary  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>            | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                        | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the woodland to the north-west.        |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i> |  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>       |  |



|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Public Protection Comments<br/>Management of Constraints:</i>                             |  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments<br/>Opportunities:</i>   |  |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability<br/>Appraisal:</b>                                   | Good   |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | The site is well related to the built form of the settlement, but occupies a visually prominent site with steep topography which has significant implications for surface water flood risk in the town. Not in accordance with current policy in the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make<br/>Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> | Assess impact on flood risk<br>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.   |
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Countryside  |
| <b>Reasoning</b>   | visual prominence. Steep topography has significant adverse implications for surface water flood risk management   |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential<br/>Capacity:</b>                                   | n/a  |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation<br/>Design Requirements:</b>                                   | n/a  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |   |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>MUW008</b>   |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No  |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | Yes   |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 1%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 1%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 2%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 4%  |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | Yes   |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium-High   |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium-High   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | Y   |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   |   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | N   |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              | Y Sytche Lane west of Sytche Close is narrow and would need to be widened with pedestrian footway added.                |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | N   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  | Cumulative impact of MUW008 & 009 (486 houses) on Sytche Lane / The A4169 (The Crescent) junction needs to be examined. |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> | 17  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>           | None  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                 | EclA required. Surveys for GCN (in ponds adjacent ), Dormice (known records nearby), Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, reptiles. Adjacent to Environmental Network to north and west and within buffer zone. Buffers would be needed to the woodland to west. .   |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>         | Retain mature trees and hedges in landscaping as part of corridor, any open space to be adjacent to and enhance Env. Network. (i.e. position against woodland edge and hedgerows.   |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                     | Improve links between tree blocks by enhancing hedgerow on western boundary.<br>Provide access to new open space for existing housing.  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>          |   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                | NE end of site located immediately adjacent to, and within the setting, of the Much Wenlock Conservation Area. No known archaeological interest but site is of a large size, so may have some archaeological potential  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>        | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation + impact on setting of CA).  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                    |   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>              |   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                    | Field boundary trees and hedges around and across site. Large block of woodland adjoining part of south-west boundary and part of north boundary  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>            | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                        | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the woodland to the north and south-west.   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i> | Allotments covered by the proposed area. Allotments provide communal spaces where social networks are formed while encouraging exercise and fresh air for those using them as well as sustainably produced food. Losing any existing allotments is considered to have potentially devastating impacts on individuals. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>       |   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                             |  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>   |  |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>                                   | Good   |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | The site is well related to the built form of the settlement, but occupies a visually prominent site with steep topography which has significant implications for surface water flood risk in the town. Not in accordance with current policy in the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> | Assess impact on flood risk<br>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.   |
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Countryside  |
| <b>Reasoning</b>   | visual prominence. Steep topography has significant adverse implications for surface water flood risk management   |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>                                   | n/a  |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>                                   | n/a  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |   |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>MUW010</b>   |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No  |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | Yes   |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 1%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 1%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 2%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 9%  |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | No  |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium-High and Medium  |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium-High and Medium  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | Y   |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   |   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | N   |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              | Y Outside 30mph limit but this can be extended but will need traffic calming / gateway feature. Needs to be joint access with MUW013. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | N   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  | Cumulative impact of MUW010, 011, 013 & 014 (198 houses) on A458 / B4371 junction needs to be examined.                               |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> | 14  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>           | Adjacent to new flood alleviation scheme. GCN and Dormouse mitigation likely to be required. Mitigation likely to reduce number of dwellings possible.  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                 | EcIA required. Surveys for GCN (in ponds adjacent), Dormice (known records nearby), Badgers (known), Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants, reptiles. Partly within Env. Network (disused railway - need to retain green route through development (check with Outdoor Rec.) Retain mature trees and hedges in landscaping as part of corridor.  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>         | Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Enhance and restore Env. Network to south-west and south-east in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                     | Promote disused railway as access route. Suggest green/brown roofs and reduce surface water run-off. (Flood alleviation scheme adjacent). Avoid topsoil on open space where possible (promote calcareous grassland).  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>          |   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                | Site has potential to affect the setting of the non-designated small country house and associated farmstead (HER PRN 23069) and lodge of The Grange. Site is detached from built edge of the town so development (especially employment uses) likely to be incongruous with the semi-rural character of the immediate surroundings. Lidar data held by the HER suggests it contains some archaeological some archaeological earthworks and therefore has some potential |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>        | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological desk based assessment and ?evaluation + setting assessment)   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                    |   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>              |   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                    | Trees and hedges around and within site. Adjacent long, overgrown double hedgerow to the south-east.  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>            | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                        | Use 20% canopy cover policy to plant woodland adjacent existing hedgerows   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i> |   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>       | Some quarrying to the northeast. Do not consider any contaminated land issues with this unless any landfilling has occurred. No evidence of filling from GIS layers. Possible noise along northern border of site from the road.  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                             | Gas protection should landfilling in quarry area would avert gassing issues. Set properties back from the road, orientation and layout of buildings, noise barriers (mounds and fencing) and glazing all available to mitigate against noise.  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>   |  |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>                                   | Poor   |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | The site is detached from the built form of the settlement outside and separated from the development boundary within the open countryside. Not in accordance with current policy in the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan upstream of flood attenuation pond.   |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> | Not known<br>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.   |
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Countryside  |
| <b>Reasoning</b>   | Whilst the site benefits from being above the flood attenuation pond and development would not represent a significant risk to flooding, it is detached from the built form of the settlement and separated from the development boundary and does not therefore compare favourably with other potential site options. |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>                                   | n/a  |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>                                   | n/a  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |   |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>MUW011</b>   |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No  |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | Yes   |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 32%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 37%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 56%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 1%  |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | No  |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium  |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | Y   |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   |   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | Y   |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              |   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | N   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  | Cumulative impact of MUW010, 011, 013 & 014 (198 houses) on A458 / B4371 junction needs to be examined. |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> | 14  |



|  |   |
|--|---|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>           | None  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                 | EclA required. Surveys for GCN (in area), Dormice (known records nearby), Badgers (known), Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants, reptiles. Within Env. Network (disused railway - need to retain green route through development (check with Outdoor Rec.)<br>Retain mature trees in landscaping as part of corridor. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>         | Enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.   |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                     | Promote disused railway as access route. Suggest green/brown roofs and reduce surface water run-off. (Flood alleviation scheme adjacent)  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>          |   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                | Site previously crossed by Much Wenlock, Craven Arms & Coalbrookdale Railway (HER PRN 08447), although track bed now entirely removed.  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>        |   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                    | Good quality design could provide an enhancement over the existing commercial usage of the site at this gateway location to the town.   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>              |   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                    | Trees and hedges around site and belt of trees across middle of site. Quality of the trees has a bearing on acceptability of development on arboricultural grounds.   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>            | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                        | little opportunity for additional planting due to small size and irregular shape of site.   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i> |   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>       | Historic railway, contamination likely. Potential noise to northern façade therefore possible constraints. Existing depot to south and east may cause noise throughout day and night.   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                             | Remediation probable for con land. Layout, orientation, glazing, ventilation and boundary treatment possible for noise. Noise assessment would be likely to consider impact of the Depot to the rear and full details of its permitted times of operation etc would be required. |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>   |  |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>                                   | Poor   |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | Brownfield site within development boundary on edge of built up area, adjacent to existing employment uses and SAMDev employment allocation.   |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> | Highway access<br>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.   |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   | Green corridor route along disused railway<br>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.   |
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>   | Yes  |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>   | Yes  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Windfall employment  |
| <b>Reasoning</b>   | natural extension to neighbouring employment uses in an accessible location  |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>                                   | 0.24Ha net   |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>                                   | Subject to the establishment of an appropriate access, appropriate contamination remediation, ecological surveys and appropriate tree management   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |  |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>MUW012</b>  |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No   |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | No   |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 1%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 3%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 23%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 0%   |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | Yes  |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium   |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium-High  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   |  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              |  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | N  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  | Y 114 houses should be able to fund (linked with MUW016) construction of roundabout on A458 needed for traffic calming / gateway purposes. To achieve a workable roundabout layout it may be necessary to incorporate triangle of land between Oakfield Park and A458. |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> | 22   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>           | None   |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                 | EclA required. GCN record c. 160m from site boundary but no ponds on site. Some potential for other protected species. Otherwise arable and low biodiversity potential. Surface water flooding has been noted for this area. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>         | Retain existing tree/shrub buffer and maintain hedge network.  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                     | Link open space to surrounding green corridors to enhance Env. Network. Provide access to green space from surrounding housing.  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>          |  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                | Site previously formed part of the Much Wenlock racecourse (HER PRN 30643) and contains the probable site of a prehistoric cropmark enclosure (HER PRN 30617). Therefore considered to hold archaeological interest.         |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>        | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological evaluation). NB a desk based Heritage Assessment was completed for the site in 2014  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                    |  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>              |  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                    | Trees and hedges around site and belts of young plantation along south-east and south-west boundaries  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>            | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                        | Use 20% canopy cover policy to connect belts of woodland with wooded school grounds north of the site, by planting across middle of the site.  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i> |  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>       | A458 to the western boundary therefore noise may require control.  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <i>Public Protection Comments<br/>Management of Constraints:</i>                         | Layout, orientation of buildings and glazing, ventilation and boundary treatment where necessary to treat for noise.  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments<br/>Opportunities:</i>                                     |   |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>                                   | Fair  |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | The site is well related to the built form of the settlement adjacent to the primary school to the South of the town with a frontage onto the A458. Not in accordance with current policy in the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan.   |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> | Flood alleviation measures<br>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   | Opportunity to help deliver a fully functional flood alleviation scheme in combination with existing development at Hunter's Gate, together with a roundabout access to the site which will provide traffic calming on the southern approach to the town.<br>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas. |
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>   | No  |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>   | No  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | See MUW012VAR   |
| <b>Reasoning</b>   | See MUW012VAR   |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>                                   | n/a   |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>                                   | n/a   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |  |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>MUW012VAR</b>   |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No   |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | No   |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 1%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 4%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 25%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 0%   |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | Yes  |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium   |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium-High  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   |  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              |  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | N  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  | Y 114 houses should be able to fund (linked with MUW016) construction of roundabout on A458 needed for traffic calming / gateway purposes. To achieve a workable roundabout layout it may be necessary to incorporate triangle of land between Oakfield Park and A458. |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> | 22   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>           | None   |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                 | EclA required. GCN record c. 160m from site boundary but no ponds on site. Some potential for other protected species. Otherwise arable and low biodiversity potential. Surface water flooding has been noted for this area. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>         | Retain existing tree/shrub buffer and maintain hedge network.  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                     | Link open space to surrounding green corridors to enhance Env. Network. Provide access to green space from surrounding housing.  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>          |  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                | Site previously formed part of the Much Wenlock racecourse (HER PRN 30643) and contains the probable site of a prehistoric cropmark enclosure (HER PRN 30617). Therefore considered to hold archaeological interest.         |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>        | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological evaluation). NB a desk based Heritage Assessment was completed for the site in 2014  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                    |  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>              | A hedgerow formerly ran along the sites southern boundary.   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                    | Trees and hedges around site and belts of young plantation along south-east and south-west boundaries  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>            | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                        | Use 20% canopy cover policy to connect belts of woodland with wooded school grounds north of the site, by planting across middle of the site.<br>Opportunity to reinstate the hedgerow along the sites southern boundary.    |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i> |  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>       | A458 to the western boundary therefore noise may require control.  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                             | Layout, orientation of buildings and glazing, ventilation and boundary treatment where necessary to treat for noise.   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>   |  |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>                                   | Fair   |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | The extension to the site is also likely to make the site more viable and facilitate the Highway infrastructure works required to make this development acceptable.  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> |  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   |  |
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>   | Yes  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | <b>Allocate as Preferred Site</b>  |
| <b>Reasoning</b>   | The extension to the site is also likely to make the site more viable and facilitate the Highway infrastructure works required to make this development acceptable. There are considerable community benefits resulting from the increased residential capacity, most notably the implications for on and off site flood alleviation at Hunters Gate and Forester Avenue.  |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>                                   | 120  |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>                                   | <p>Access into the site will be provided by a new roundabout on the A458 to be funded by the development. The site will deliver a maximum of 120 dwellings.</p> <p>Development will be required to deliver substantial community benefits both on and off site by way of flood alleviation. Specifically, development must demonstrate how properties currently at risk of flooding at Hunters Gate and Forester Avenue will be protected for all storm events up to and including the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) event plus an appropriate allowance for climate change, as well as removing exceedance water from the existing surface water and foul sewer systems serving Much Wenlock. Where offsite attenuation features are proposed it must also demonstrate that the design of these features will ensure there is no increase in flood risk to properties downstream of Much Wenlock on the Farley Brook for all storm events up to and including the 1% AEP event plus an appropriate allowance for climate change. Given the importance of this issue, development proposal will be required to provide sufficient detailed designs evidencing how these measures will be achieved in practice in order for planning permission to be granted.</p> <p>Any residual surface water flood risk within the site will be managed by excluding development from the affected areas of the site, which will form part of the green Infrastructure / open space network. Flood and water management measures must not displace water elsewhere.</p> <p>Substantial and effective boundary treatments will be required in order to create a buffer around the site. This will include the reinstatement of a hedgerow along the sites southern boundary.</p> <p>Green infrastructure links will be provided through the site linking to the open space provision and the public right of way network beyond the site. High-quality trees and hedgerows will be retained.</p> <p>Acoustic design, layout, use of green infrastructure and appropriate building materials will be used to appropriately manage noise arising from the A458.</p> |



|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |  |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>MUW014</b>  |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No   |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | No   |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 8%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 10%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 18%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 22%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 6%   |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | Yes  |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium-High  |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium-High  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   |  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              |  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | N  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  | Cumulative impact of MUW010, 011, 013 & 014 (198 houses) on A458 / B4371 junctions needs to be examined. |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> | 17   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>           | Immediately adjacent to priority calcareous grassland at NT car park site. Aerial photos indicate similar habitat possible. Priority habitat should be avoided if at all possible - i.e. we shouldn't allocated such a site. Presence of valuable grassland to be determined by an EclA including a detailed National Vegetation Classification level survey. If calcareous 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. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                 | EclA required. Good quality semi-natural vegetation including grassland, scattered trees/shrubs and hedges within Environmental Network. Surveys for GCN (in ponds within 500m, at least one at c.110m), Dormice (known records nearby), Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants, reptiles. Avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures would be required under MD12.  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>         | See previous boxes. Otherwise, retain mature trees and hedges in landscaping as part of corridor, any open space to be adjacent to, buffer and enhance Env. Network (Blakeway Hollow). Need to buffer existing priority habitat and so only a reduced number of houses would be possible.  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                     | If habitats are as expected only damage likely.  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>          |  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                | Site previously formed of an area of lime workings (HER PRN 04534) and contains related archaeological features. Therefore considered to hold archaeological interest.   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>        | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ? Level 2 earthwork survey).   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                    |  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>              |  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                    | Mature trees within and around site present potentially significant constraint to development  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>            | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                        | development stand-off required around existing significant trees - might restrict development to southern part of site   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i> |  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>       | Past quarried area to west may cause gassing or other issues. Noise from road to the south of the site.  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                             | Remediation including gas protection possible. Noise could be mitigated by introducing distance, site location and orientation, glazing, noise barriers.   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>   |  |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>                                   | Poor   |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | Small site located adjacent to but outside the development boundary, downstream of the flood attenuation pond to the west of the town is more distant from local facilities, services and infrastructure than some other site options. Not in accordance with current policy in the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan. |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> | Asses impact on nearby SSSI, impact on Conservation area<br>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.   |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.   |
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Countryside  |
| <b>Reasoning</b>   | Distance from town services and potential for adverse implications for surface water flood risk management and does not therefore compare favourably with other potential site options.  |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>                                   | n/a  |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>                                   | n/a  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |  |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>MUW016</b>  |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No   |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | No   |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 2%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 0%   |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | Yes  |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium   |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium-High  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   |  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | N  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              | Y South of Oakfield Park the existing highway (Callaughton Lane) is narrow and would need to be widened for around 50m with pedestrian footway added. These comments assume that the 12 homes development - 16/02910/FUL - does not go ahead.                          |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | N  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  | Y 410 houses should be able to fund (linked with MUW012) construction of roundabout on A458 needed for traffic calming / gateway purposes. To achieve a workable roundabout layout it may be necessary to incorporate triangle of land between Oakfield Park and A458. |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> | 16   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>           | None   |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                 | EclA required. Arable site but surveys for Dormice, Badgers, Bats (in trees and hedges), nesting birds.  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>         | Retention of mature trees in hedges and hedgerows.   |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                     | Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements and access to greenspace for existing housing to north of site. Link open space to existing hedgerow system. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>          |  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                | No known archaeological interest but site is of a large size, so may have some archaeological potential  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>        | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA +field evaluation).  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                    |  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>              |  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                    | Trees and hedges around but not within site.   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>            | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                        | landscaping to enhance canopy cover and internal landscape of site   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i> |  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>       | Possible road noise to very east of the site   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <i>Public Protection Comments<br/>Management of Constraints:</i>                             | Glazing, orientation and location of dwellings.   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments<br/>Opportunities:</i>   |   |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability<br/>Appraisal:</b>                                   | Fair  |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | Large, sloping site to south of town adjacent to recently completed Callaughton Ash housing development. Not in accordance with current policy in the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan.  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make<br/>Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> | Potential flood attenuation risk<br>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.  |
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>   | No  |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>   | No  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Countryside   |
| <b>Reasoning</b>   | Significantly larger area than required to deliver settlement guideline. Visually prominent site. Potential adverse implications for surface water flood risk management and does not therefore compare favourably with other potential site options. |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential<br/>Capacity:</b>                                   | n/a   |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation<br/>Design Requirements:</b>                                   | n/a   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |  |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>MUW016VAR</b>   |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No   |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | No   |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 0%   |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | No   |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium   |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium-High  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   |  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              | Assuming the road widen and footway provision along Callaughton Lane has been delivered by the Callaughtons Ash development.   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  | Assuming the development will fund a review of the whole route between the site and the crossing of the A458 to ensure a continuous and fully accessible routes for pedestrians and fund any necessary improvements. |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> | 17   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>           | None  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                 | Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds.<br>The hedgerows and trees will need to be buffered.   |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>         | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                     |   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>          |   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                | No known archaeological interest but site is of a medium size, so may have some archaeological potential  |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>        | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation).   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                    |   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>              |   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                    | Mature trees and hedgerow to east and west boundaries.  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>            | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                        | enhance tree cover within this arable site, to deliver net gain for biodiversity.   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i> |   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>       |   |



|  |   |
|--|---|
| <i>Public Protection Comments<br/>Management of Constraints:</i>                         |   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments<br/>Opportunities:</i>                                     |   |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>                                   | Good  |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | variation on MUW016 is more appropriately scaled to support the Town's growth requirements.   |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> | Potential flood attenuation risk<br>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.   |
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>   | No  |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>   | No  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Countryside   |
| <b>Reasoning</b>   | Whilst the site is of a more appropriate scale than previously promoted to the Council, it is considered there remains more sustainable options to support the town's growth, including supporting community benefit. |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>                                   | n/a   |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>                                   | n/a   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |   |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>MUW017</b>   |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No  |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | No  |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 1%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 1%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 3%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 0%  |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | Yes   |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Very High and Medium  |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Very High and Medium-High   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | N   |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   | Y assume connection will be made through Forester Avenue which ends a few metres short of the boundary. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | Y   |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              |   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | Y   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  |   |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> | 21  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>           | None  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                 | Some potential for protected species in hedges. Otherwise arable and low biodiversity potential.  |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>         | Retain and enhance hedgerows and trees.   |
| <i>Ecology Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                     | Link open space to tree belt and hedge to west and planted woodland belt to the west to enhance green corridors and ecological network. Provide access to green space from surrounding housing. |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>          |   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                |   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>        |   |
| <i>Heritage Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                    |   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i>              |   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>                    | No trees within site but adjoins shelterbelt plantation to the west and linear strip of woodland to the east.   |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Management of Constraints:</i>            | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement  |
| <i>Tree Comments</i><br><i>Opportunities:</i>                        | Use 20% canopy cover policy to connect belts of woodland on either side of the site.  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Significant Constraints:</i> |   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments</i><br><i>Other Constraints:</i>       |   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                             |  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>   |  |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>                                   | Fair   |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | Located adjacent to but outside the development boundary, south of the existing Hunters gate development. Not in accordance with current policy in the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan.  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> | Potential flood attenuation risk<br>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas.   |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   | Potential to help address existing residual flood attenuation risk in existing built areas adjacent to the site. Potential opportunity to improve local environmental network.<br>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.<br>See comments from relevant service areas. |
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | Countryside  |
| <b>Reasoning</b>   | Whilst development of the site could be acceptable in principle, it does not compare favourably with other potential site options.   |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>                                   | n/a  |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>                                   | n/a  |

# Community Hub: Cressage

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |  |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>CES002</b>  |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No   |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | Yes  |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 0%   |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | No   |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium   |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   | A458 and Shore Lane  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | N  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              | Y. Existing 30 mph speed limit on Shore Lane needs to be extended and necessary traffic calming provided. The amount of development traffic using Shore Lane will need to be limited. Footways to be provided along site frontages. Assumes a new junction on A458 with pedestrian crossing facilities to reach footway on north side.       |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | N.   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  | Y. If traffic using Shore Lane is limited as there is no scope to introduce a footway along Shore Lane to link to existing footways on A458. The potential to deliver a footway link from the site to the existing footway on the south side appears restricted. Therefore a crossing to the north side is essential. Potentially 108 homes. |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> |  |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>  | None   |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>  | TPO'd trees in the north-east of the site. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. The hedgerows will need to be buffered.  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                                       | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.  |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>   | See accompanying document  |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>  |  |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>  | Potential impact on settings of Grade II listed Shore Cottage (NHLE ref. 1366866) and 4 Shrewsbury Road. Lidar data indicates earthwork remains of ridge and medium size of site also suggests it may have other archaeological potential.   |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                                      | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs, archaeological DBA + field evaluation).  |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>  |  |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>  |  |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>  | Scattered field trees  |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>  | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan.  |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>  | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>                               |  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>                                     | Road noise to north.   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                             | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings, boundary treatment and combinations thereof to mitigate for road noise.  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>   |  |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>                                   | -3   |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | <p>This greenfield site sits on the western edge of Cressage on land that rises away from the settlement to the south and lies close to the Wood Lane Local Wildlife Site. The site is bounded north by the A458 providing a short road frontage that might accommodate a highway junction requiring the 30mph zone to be moved west towards the village entrance and a crossing to access the highway footway along the north of the A458. Shore Lane bounds the site to the east but has limited vehicular capacity. The two highways form a constrained junction that accommodates 1 Shrewsbury Road. The site and adjacent properties would be exposed to the noise effects from these highways requiring an appropriate design solution. The rising land increases the landscape and visual sensitivity to medium but removes the risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1) across the site. The site is open with field trees and hedgerows, including a Tree Preservation Order to the north-east, offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including compensatory planting to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has potential archaeological significance and forms the setting of two Grade II listed buildings requiring a Heritage Assessment. The site has a moderate negative sustainability compared to other sites in the village reflecting the environmental values of the site and the proximity of some key local services.</p> |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>                         | <b>No</b>   |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>                       | <b>No</b>   |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                                  | <b>Remain as Countryside</b>  |
| <b>Reasoning</b>                                       | <p>There are more preferable sites available within the settlement which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this larger site in the open countryside. These other sites have a better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer opportunities for planning gain, better access to the local highway network and to create more attractive gateways into the village. In contrast site CES002 would extend the settlement well beyond its current built form and layout and would significantly increase the scale of the existing village whilst potentially compromising the open character and environmental values of CES002.</p> |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b> |   |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b> |   |



|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |   |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>CES005</b>   |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No  |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | No  |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 0%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 0%  |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | No  |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium  |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | Medium  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | Y   |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   | A458 and Wood Lane  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | N   |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              | Y. Existing 30 mph speed limit on Wood Lane needs to be extended and necessary traffic calming provided. The amount of development traffic using Wood Lane will need to be limited. Footways to be provided along site frontages. Assumes a new junction on A458 Harley Road with pedestrian crossing facilities to reach footway on east side. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | N   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  | Y. If traffic using Wood Lane is limited as there is no scope to introduce a footway along Shore Lane. There is no footway on the west side of there A458 linking the site to the village and no potential to deliver within the highway. Therefore a crossing to the east side is essential.<br>Potentially 72 homes                           |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> |   |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>  | None  |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>  | Adjacent to Wood Lane Cressage LWS. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. The hedgerows will need to be buffered.  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                                       | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.  |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>   | See accompanying document  |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>  |  |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>  | No known archaeological interest but site is of a medium size so may have some archaeological potential  |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                                      | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).   |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>  |  |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>  |  |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>  | Agricultural land - wooded belt to west adjacent   |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>  | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan.  |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>  | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>                               |  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>                                     | Noise from road to the east.   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                             | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings, boundary treatment and combinations thereof to mitigate for road noise.  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>   |  |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>                                   | -2   |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | This greenfield site sits on the southern edge of Cressage on a flat level site, with significant agricultural land value, elevated above the settlement and close to the Wood Lane Local Wildlife Site. The site is bounded east by the A458 providing a short road frontage that might accommodate a highway junction with boundary footway requiring the 30mph zone to be moved south towards the village entrance and a crossing to access the highway footway along the east of the A458. Wood Lane bounds the site to the north and west but has limited vehicular capacity and no capacity for a footway. The two highways form a constrained junction that accommodates some development including a telephone exchange. The site and adjacent properties would be exposed to the noise effects from these highways requiring an appropriate design solution. The rising land increases the landscape and visual sensitivity to medium but removes the risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1) across the site. The site is open with ponds, field trees and hedgerows offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation and mitigation / enhancement including compensatory planting to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has no known heritage value but the size and open character suggest the need for a Heritage Assessment. The site has a moderate negative sustainability rating compared to other sites in the village reflecting the balance between the environmental values of the site and the proximity of some key local services. |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.  |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>                         | <b>No</b>   |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>                       | <b>Yes</b>  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                                  | <b>Allocate for residential development</b>   |
| <b>Reasoning</b>                                       | <p>This is the preferred site for development in the village. This moderately sized site offers a better opportunity to meet the needs of the community. This site has a better relationship to the built form of the settlement, offer opportunities for planning gain with better access to the local highway network with the possibility of delivering highway improvements and much needed traffic calming measures. The development of this open site on the southern entrance to the village offers the opportunity to create an attractive gateway into the village. The development of this site, whilst lying in the countryside, offers the potential to consolidate the current built form and layout of the village requiring an appropriate design scheme and layout that respects the open character and environmental values of the site.</p>   |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b> | 60 dwellings  |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b> | <p>Site proposed for broad range of housing with dwelling types and sizes to help meet local housing needs including entry level housing. Location on A458 may require stand-off distance, layout, orientation, landscaping, open space and design to enhance amenity with possible sound attenuation and ventilation measures closer to A458. The site will incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage, informed by a sustainable drainage strategy. Any residual surface water risks will be managed by excluding development from the affected areas which will form part of the Green Infrastructure network. Water management measures must not displace water elsewhere.</p> <p>Access from A458 through new highway access to create a gateway feature for village and providing a footway along the frontage to crossing over A458 to existing footway network east linking into village. A secondary pedestrian and cycling access possible on short frontage to Wood Lane. Speed restrictions positioned south of site with traffic calming measures supporting gateway feature at highway access. Relevant supporting studies to be undertaken particularly transport assessments, drainage, heritage and especially archaeology interest, ecology, tree and hedgerow surveys including protection of Wood Lane Local Wildlife Site from increasing emissions, protection of tree / woodland belt to west. Recommendations of studies to be clearly reflected in the development scheme.</p> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>  |  |
| <b>Site Reference:</b>  | <b>CES006</b>  |
| <i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>   | No   |
| <i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>   | Yes  |
| <i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>  | Yes  |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>  | 100%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>   | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>  | 0%   |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>  | 72%  |
| <i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>   | 0%   |
| <i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>   | No   |
| <i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | None   |
| <i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>  | None   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>   | Y  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>   | A458 and Sheinton Road   |
| <i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>                      | N  |
| <i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>                              | Y. If access is onto Sheinton Road only and the footway is widened along site frontage on A458 and new length of footway provided along frontage of site on Sheinton Road. |
| <i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>   | N  |
| <i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>  | Y. Assuming the development will provide land and fund Improvements to the Sheinton Road / A458 junction.  |
| <b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b> |  |
| <i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>  | None   |
| <i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>  | Ecla and surveys for bats and GCNs (ponds within 250m) and nesting birds.  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                                       | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.   |
| <i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>   | See accompanying document   |
| <i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>  |   |
| <i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>  | The Eagles public house is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset located in a key location within the historic core of the settlement. Any development proposals should seek to retain and convert this building.  |
| <i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                                      | Heritage Assessment (Level 2 historic building assessment)  |
| <i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>  |   |
| <i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>  |   |
| <i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>  | Curtilage trees and mature tree at entrance mainly hardstanding   |
| <i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>  | Standard BS5837 Tree Survey / Arb Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan.   |
| <i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>  | Use 20% canopy cover policy to increase woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>                               |   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>                                     | Noise from road to west.  |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>                             | Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings, boundary treatment and combinations thereof to mitigate for road noise.   |
| <i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>   |   |
| <b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>                                   | -1  |
| <b>Strategic Considerations:</b>   | This brownfield site is in the centre of the village and accommodates the redundant building and site of The Eagles former public house. The site is bounded west by the A458 with the former vehicular access into the car parking area of the building curtilage. New highway arrangements would require the widening of the footway to the front of the former pub building. Whilst Sheinton Road provides a less intrusive vehicular access, Sheinton Road is a narrow roadway that serves a broad range of land uses and would require significant improvements to the junction with Station Road and the A458. The site and adjacent properties would also be exposed to the noise effects from these highways requiring an appropriate design solution. The site has no risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1) but there is strong evidence of historical flood events presumably in severe conditions. Despite the significant amount of development across the site, Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments would be required especially of the site margins to protect habitat and to assess the need for retention or complementary planting to mitigate for the effects of development. The site has potential heritage significance sitting close to the site of the Old Hall and Castle site suggesting the need for a Heritage Assessment. The site has a nominal negative sustainability compared to other sites in the village reflecting the environmental values of the site and the proximity to many key local services. |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b> | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.   |
| <b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>   | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Potential for Windfall?</b>                         | <b>Yes</b>  |
| <b>Potential for Allocation?</b>                       | <b>Yes</b>  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                                  | <b>Allocate for residential development</b>   |
| <b>Reasoning</b>                                       | <p>The Eagles has been a redundant brownfield site for some considerable time but redevelopment for other uses has been prevented by the previous designation of Cressage in the countryside. The redevelopment of the site is therefore a significant community aspiration that will meet the needs of the community for a range of housing types and sizes whilst providing a significant and long awaited visual enhancement to the character of the village.</p>  |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b> | 5 dwellings   |
| <b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b> | <p>Redevelopment to form two distinct but interrelated elements to deliver up to 4 dwellings on the site through: Sympathetic conversion of the former pub' building for up to 2 dwellings, to conserve and enhance the significance of the designated heritage asset and to improve the appearance and appreciation of the asset and the site. Develop the former car park for up to three new dwellings set back from the pub' conversion and the A458/Sheinton Road junction to respect the significance and setting of the heritage asset and improve the visibility and safety at the junction possibly with a partial repositioning of the site boundary wall to improve sightlines south on the A458. To close the site to vehicular access from the A458 in favour of the existing vehicular access from Sheinton Road. To accommodate a footway within the site between the A458 and Sheinton Road to replace the narrow footway to the A458 and to facilitate pedestrian movements from Sheinton Road. Relevant supporting studies will be undertaken particularly transport assessments, heritage including archaeology, ecology in the redundant building, site margins and adjacent undisturbed sites, tree survey, surface water flood risk / drainage and ground contamination with their recommendations clearly reflected in the proposed development scheme. The site will incorporate appropriate drainage infrastructure informed by a sustainable drainage strategy and will ensure the water management measures do not displace water elsewhere. Site design will manage the proximity to the A458 and the need for distance, layout, orientation, sound attenuation and ventilation to reduce any impacts on amenity.</p> |